

THE EFFECTS OF THE LANGUAGE OF HUMANISM
AS EXPRESSED IN THE NEW THEOLOGY
ON ORTHODOX CHRISTIANS

by

Ronald L. Sundbye
A.B., Baker University, 1953
S.T.B., Boston University, 1956

Submitted to the Department of
Speech and the Faculty of the
Graduate School of the University
of Kansas in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree
of Master of Arts.

Redacted Signature

Instructor in charge

Redacted Signature

For the department

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Purpose	1
Background of the Study	1
The New Theology	1
Paul Tillich	9
Dietrich Bonhoeffer	11
Humanism	13
Orthodox Christianity	15
Significance of Study	18
Methodology	21
Review of the Literature	32
Definition of Terms	34
II. ANALYSIS OF THE LITERATURE	35
The New Theology	35
Humanism	43
Orthodox Christianity	49
Comparison Table	55
III. COMPARISONS	57
Differences Based on Form	57
Differences Based on Content	59
The Devaluation of Religion	59
The Question of Immortality	61
The Question of God	63
An Emphasis on the Dignity of Man	65
The Emphasis on Love as Supreme Value	66
An Existential Orientation	68
Interpersonal Emphases	70
An Emphasis on the Helplessness of Man	71
Words Which are Unique to a Thought System	73

	Page
IV. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	75
Suggestions for Further Research	80
BIBLIOGRAPHY	81
APPENDICES	84
APPENDIX A: Excerpts from <u>Honest to God</u> by Bishop A. T. Robinson	85
APPENDIX B: Excerpts from <u>Humanism as the Next Step</u> by the Morains	96
APPENDIX C: Excerpts from <u>A Firm Faith for Today</u> by Dr. Harold Bosley	104

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

I. PURPOSE

The purpose of this paper is to deal with the question, How do the language forms of orthodox Christianity, the new theology and humanism differ from one another? This will be done through a study of selected books and by a language analysis. An effort will be made to determine the effects of the language of humanism, as expressed in the new theology, on orthodox Christians.

II. BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY

The New Theology

The new theology was a movement that struck the churches during the 60's. The author was, at that time, the minister of a large downtown church in Lawrence, Kansas and had first-hand opportunity to assess the encounter. Basically, the new theology rested on a humanistic base. God is pushed to the periphery of life and man ascends in prominence and importance. It is clearly stated that God is not "a" being. The image of a "person-God" is destroyed. And the challenge is leveled that man must now live without recourse to a God. It is very likely that this movement planted the seeds for the "God is Dead" movement which came soon thereafter.

The decade in which it occurred must be understood in order to approach any reasonable understanding of the new theology. Perhaps Sidney

Ahlstrom gives us the strongest feeling for those years when he writes:

A Roman Catholic was elected to the presidency of the United States with a tiny popular plurality--and then at the peak of his public favor was struck down and laid to rest while the nation and the world, half stupefied by the succession of events, joined in a concert of grief such as human technology had never before made possible. In the meantime, an aged cardinal who had been elevated to the papacy in 1958 was carrying out a revolution in the Roman Catholic church whose reverberations still rumble back and forth across the Christian world with implications for the future that defy human calculation. (12, p. 20)

Ahlstrom goes on to point out that things did not stop there. The Protestant establishment in America received still another blow in 1962 when the Supreme Court delivered its judgement on the one man/one vote/ principle, and again in its 1963 ruling on the question of religious ceremonies in the public schools. But even more dramatic and more revolutionary in character was the culmination of the civil rights movement. Finally, as if fate were determined to make the year a turning point in history, President Lyndon Johnson authorized the bombing of North Vietnam in February 1965, and by the end of the year escalated American troop strength there to 200,000. It was now an American war in Southeast Asia. (12, p. 20)

Certainly, the decade experienced a fundamental shift in American moral and religious attitudes. It was not by chance that phrases such as post-Puritan, post-Protestant, post-Christian, post-modern, and even post-historical were commonly used to describe the American scene. In short, the 1960's were a decade when the old grounds of national confidence, patriotic idealism, moral traditionalism, and even of historic Judeo-Christian theism, were awash. Presuppositions that had held firm for

centuries, even millennia-were being widely questioned. Some sensational manifestations have come and gone, as fads and fashions will, but the existence of a basic shift of mood rooted in deep social and institutional dislocations was anything but ephemeral. The nation was confronting revolutionary circumstances whose effects were, in the nature of the case, irreversible. Sidney Ahlstrom concludes, "Thus, we are given good reasons for believing that the decade of the 1960s, even at the profoundest ethical and religious levels of experience, will take a distinctive place in American history." (12, p. 21) Altizer, the famous "God-is-dead" theologian, saw the changes so profound that he wrote, "All religious meaning has collapsed in our world; so long as we remain without our own world, our actual condition and historical situation, we can know only the death of God." (8, p. 155) Kai Nielsen, a modern day theologian, describes just how deeply affected were many people when he writes the following:

Christians know that they live in a revolutionary world, and many of them expect the forms of church life and thought to take on revolutionary elements of change. They are dissatisfied with the theological formulas come down from other ages. Instead of an escape from freedom, this generation seeks freedom to escape from the mold of the past. There are in it a creativity, a restlessness, an impatience that bewilder the conservative and cause uneasiness in the mind of anyone questioning for an eternal word from God and in the church. Christians of this restless ilk would like to read a theological journal which cites change every day along with their Times at breakfast. (8, p. 9)

This decade was also a time when many churches were undergoing almost revolutionary changes in the liturgy. Many things happened on Sunday morning during the worship service that had never happened before.

Popular records were played for their "messages," there was the use of dance, and many kinds of audio-visuals were used. It was into this period that the new theology made its entrance.

The reaction on the part of church members to the new theology was varied. But most church members, and this is based partly on the author's personal experience with the movement, were shocked. Confusion was also evident, and it seemed very hard for many people to grasp what the new theology was all about. On one occasion, the present author preached a sermon on Tillich's concept of God as "depth," and it was announced that a discussion would be held that evening. Fifty persons came, and unprecedented number for an evening meeting of any sort. They were, as has already been suggested, either confused or shocked.

It is an assumption that the new theology was, in fact, rejected by orthodox Christians. There seems to be little evidence of its presence now and no books on the subject have been written since the 1960's. One bit of evidence to support this assumption is that in the late 1960's and early 1970's thousands of young people who had been exposed to the new theology left the organized church for something quite conservative and quite unlike the new theology. J. B. Walker writes:

Fundamentalist forms of Christianity, seen in such groups as the Jesus Freaks or the Children of God, apparently thrive on the west coast of America, and bid fair to make Jesus, not drugs, the way of life for many a former flower-child. The creed of these groups is simple. It is that of extreme evangelical protestantism and based on a literal and uncritical acceptance of the Bible as a sole and adequate source of all truth, and upon a certain kind of religious experience as the assurance that one is saved. (16, p. 2)

The basic message of this 'old time religion' is straight from the U.S. Bible belt but has been adapted so as to harmonize more agreeably with the new style and meet more directly the emotional needs of many young Americans. Walker suggests we may be able to gauge the strength of this new trend by taking note of the growing number of gospel-style songs that appear in pop music charts, or by the Broadway success of the musicals *Superstar* and *Godspell* where Jesus, it appears, is being promoted as the new cult hero of the young. (16, p. 2) This exodus of the young could well represent a rejection of the new theology with its emphasis on humanism.

Hugo Meynell, writing from the standpoint of an orthodox Christian position in a book entitled, The New Theology and Modern Theologians, takes some sharp differences with the new theology which are probably typical of other critics. He says there are two main weaknesses in the new reformation, "lack of contact with the riches of traditional Christian thought, and internal inconsistency." (13, p. 7) The first of these is illustrated in the amazing way in which thorny intellectual problems in Christian doctrine are treated as though they were new, as though contemporary theologians had been the first in history to tackle them. Meynell says we are hardly entitled to speak as though men like Luther and Aquinas had never lived. Occasionally, when reading Bishop John Robinson's book on new theology entitled, Honest to God, Meynell contends we get the impression that the author has never grappled seriously with the thought of any theological writing between the Second Letter of Peter and Tillich! "We ought at least to know what the intellectual achievement

of traditional Christendom is, before purporting to go beyond it." (13, p. 8) Bishop Robinson contends that modern theology is teaching us not to believe in a God 'out there,' but to realize that God is the source, ground and goal of our existence. However, Meynell points out that Aquinas, in the second, third and fifth of his five proofs of God's existence, had conceived of God "as precisely the source, ground, and goal not only of human beings but of all else that is not God. What purports to be contemporary discovery in theology, in fact, turns out to be medieval metaphysics, summarily expressed and insufficiently worked out." (13, p. 8)

But the striking feature of the new theology, contends the critic Meynell, is its "incoherence."

In the polemic against the notion of 'the God out there,' it is impossible to discover which of two quite different ideas is being attacked. Are we being exhorted to stop believing in a God who is 'out there' in the same sense as physical objects are 'out there'? Few intelligent christians at any time, so far as I can see, have believed in such a God, at least when they thought at all about the matter; though, to be sure, all christians often need reminding that they ought to think carefully about their faith. The God who creates and sustains whatever else exists cannot be just one thing among others. One would infer, then, that the bishop was hardly giving christians a reminder on a matter so elementary as this. On the other hand, is he trying to stop christians believing in a God who is 'out there' in the sense that he is other than man? Is he telling us that we are no longer to believe in a God whose power is distinct from our power, whose action is other than our action, and whose judgement and forgiveness of man are more than a high-flown expression for man's judgement and forgiveness of himself? (13, p. 10)

Meynell contends that to stop believing in a God who is 'out there' in this sense is to stop being a Christian in anything remotely resembling

the traditional sense. The bishop's demand is trivial on one interpretation and on another makes nonsense of the whole of Christian belief as traditionally understood. At one point the bishop rightly contrasts the obedience intrinsic to the Christian life with what he calls the "do-it-yourself" philosophy of humanism. But surely, comments Meynell, obedience implied something to which obedience is due. If we are contemptuous of tradition with its cartloads of metaphysics, we ought to show some signs of being able to do better ourselves in clarifying distinctions and pinpointing difficulties. So Meynell concludes, "I do not see these in most of the proponents of the new theology." (13, p. 10)

There is a curious neglect of the question of what is central and essential, what is peripheral and subsidiary, in traditional Christian doctrine, and how one can distinguish between them. Furthermore, the new theologians are often amazingly forgetful of the traditional Christian doctrine of the "last things"--of death, judgement, heaven, and hell. The word "forgetful" is used advisedly, for the strange thing is not that these doctrines are clearly set out and rejected but simply that they are not discussed at all, and one might infer that hope and fear for the future, and the conviction that God had made certain promises bearing on our fate beyond the present life, had never played a part in the belief of Christians. Meynell asks the new theologians, "Are we being asked to stop believing in a resurrection of the dead or life of the world to come, or even in a future existence for men as disembodied spirits? Or are we not so much to disabuse ourselves of these false hopes as to forget that Christians have ever held them?" (13, p. 11) Meynell summarizes:

The truth seems to be that there is in much contemporary theology a vicious circle of historical scepticism and theological triviality, each of which, for the reasons which I have suggested, reinforces the other. A theology with no stake in any state of affairs but Christian experience or behavior here and now is safe, but by the same token it may be hardly worth having. One might apply to theology the scientific maxim that the best hypothesis is not the one which cannot conceivably be falsified in all kinds of ways, turns out not to be so when the relevant observations and experiments are performed. (13, p. 23)

David Jenkins, Fellow and Chaplain of Queen's College, Oxford, wrote an essay entitled, "Whither the Doctrine of God Now", in which he clearly stated the fears and concerns which many orthodox Christians share regarding the new theology. Bishop Robinson has called for an end to theism, the end of a transcendent and personal God. Jenkins replies, "For theism to come to an end in this world would only leave everyone as atheist." (9, p. 64)

The bishop also calls for a demythologization of the New Testament. C. B. Armstrong, Principal of Worcester Ordination College in England, replied as follows in an article entitled, "Christianity Without Religion:"

Further, if we merely theologize the New Testament, as the Archbishop asks, into a partially Johannine presentation, its historicity and authority are left in the air. Again he thinks that Dr. Robinson forgets God's aspect of Creator, and the withdrawal for the vision of his holiness which is essential for creatural worship. And finally that although self-effacing love is the root of the matter, we cannot, anymore than Jesus Christ did, throw aside the Law, as interpreted by the Church, and embodied institutionally as divine elements in the natural order. (9, p. 25)

Two of the leading theologians in the new theology were Paul Tillich and Dietrich Bonhoeffer. We turn now to some information about each of these men.

Paul Tillich. Paul Tillich was born August 20, 1886 in Starzeddel, Kries Guben, Germany. He came to the United States in 1933 and was naturalized in 1940. He was the son of Johannes (a Lutheran pastor) and Mathilde Tillich. In 1924 he married Hannah Werner, and they had two children. Dr. Tillich studied at the University of Berlin, the University of Tubingen, the University of Breslau (where he received a PhD.) and the University of Halle, Licentiat of Theology. He was ordained a minister in the Evangelical Lutheran Church in 1912. He taught at a variety of schools in Germany and then came to Union Theological Seminary in New York as Professor of Philosophy and Theology in 1933, remaining until 1954. From there he went to Harvard University, Cambridge, and from there to the Chicago Divinity School where he held the John Nuven Professorship in Theology.

He was active in establishing a German republic after World War I and was dismissed from the University of Frankfurt in 1933 for conflict with the Nazi Regime. He served on the executive committee of the American Committee for Christian Refugees, was vice-chairman of the Center for German and Austrian Art and Handicraft, and was provisional chairman of the Council for a Democratic Germany.

Some of the most profound and controversial elements in Tillich's thought appear in the section of his Systematic Theology where, in answer to the problems of being, the doctrine of God as being-itself is elaborated. Here Tillich states that "God does not exist," that "he is being itself beyond essence and existence." "To argue that God exists is to deny him."

Moreover, to say that God is being-itself is to make the only non-symbolic statement possible. Hastings and Hastings write that "beyond this, all assertions about God are analogies, never clear and unambiguous." (6, p. 210) They continue:

Yet such assertions can be justified on the basis of the analogia entis, which declares that everything finite participates in the infinite. Then Tillich tries to interpret the traditional symbols of God as living, as personal, as creative, as love, as Lord and Father. In spite of difficulties, one thing is obvious: Tillich's God is 'high and lifted up'. He is beyond naturalism and supra-naturalism, never a being, not even the highest being. But it is doubtful whether in his doctrine of God Tillich has maintained the delicate balance between philosophical concept and theological symbol. (6, pp. 210, 211)

Tillich's way of interpreting the Christ is to use Paul's phrase, the "New Being." The power of New Being in Jesus as the Christ is evident from his words, his deeds, and chiefly from his sufferings. That is, from the sacrifice of himself as a particular individual (Jesus) to himself as the bearer of New Being (Christ). And Tillich's key to an understanding of atonement is the idea of participation. First, God in Christ participating in man's existential estrangement and its destructive consequences, then man participating in God's saving power (New Being present in Jesus as the Christ).

Tillich has certainly not been without critics. One of these, Hugo Meynell who wrote The New Theology and Modern Theologians, makes a rather typical comment when he says:

Tillich's great theological vice, but one which he shares with a frighteningly large number of contemporary theologians,

especially Protestant, is his tendency to dissolve the content of the faith into our subjective attitude to it. On the manner in which religious ritual, sacred scripture, and our day-to-day affairs affect and are affected by faith, he is very good indeed. But on those aspects of the faith which transcend our subjective attitude and its immediate effects, such as the existence of God, the historicity of Jesus Christ, and the future consummation for which Christians hope, he is radically defective. (13, p. 156)

Dietrich Bonhoeffer. Dietrich Bonhoeffer was born on February 4, 1906, in Breslau, Germany. His father, Karl Ludwig Bonhoeffer, was an eminent neurologist, and his mother, Paula, came from a distinguished family. There were eight children in the Bonhoeffer household, Dietrich and his twin sister Sabine being the sixth and seventh. In 1912 the family moved to Berlin. Karl Bonhoeffer, appointed to the newly founded chair of psychiatry in the University of Berlin, set up house in a suburb favored by members of the university. So there was a maximum of cultural stimulation in the house. The atmosphere within the family circle was agnostic and dominated by scientific interests. When he was sixteen, Dietrich decided to enter the ministry of the Prussian Church. His biographers do not give motivations for this decision.

In 1923 the seventeen-year-old student entered the University of Tübingen, taking classes in theology and philosophy there and also finding time for travel in Italy and North Africa. In 1925 he enrolled at the University of Berlin, and two years later, at twenty-one, obtained his Licentiate in Theology, having completed a dissertation entitled Sanctorum Communio: A Dogmatic Inquiry Into the Sociology of the Church.

In April 1943 Bonhoeffer and his brother-in-law were arrested at his parents' house. The suspicion was that they had been part of a bomb plot to destroy Hitler which, in fact, they had. Part of the manuscript of Bonhoeffer's book, Ethics, fell into the hands of the Gestapo; but the greater part was successfully hidden and was retrieved and pieced together after the war. It was from his time in the prison that we owe his Letters and Papers from Prison. He was hanged in the prison at Flossenbug just a few days before the arrival of the Allies. His brother and his brothers-in-law were executed around the same time, at the concentration camp of Sachsenhausen.

Bonhoeffer speaks often to the theme of secularity and "a world come of age." His teachings and writings have been variously interpreted. Some find in them a very liberal call to a religionless Christianity. Other more conservative writers are more cautious. Among those who approach the teachings with caution are Kenneth Hamilton who writes:

When Bonhoeffer speaks of 'secular' life he usually is talking about our day-to-day involvement in the business of living--quite without any theory of the status of 'the secular.' While his references to 'religionless Christianity' have been interpreted as an invitation to throw out the concept of the super-natural and to concentrate our energies on improving the present lot of mankind, there is absolutely no indication that he ever wavered in his declared belief that wishing to build 'the secular city' is the way of faithlessness. . . .The 'world come of age' is reasoned by Bonhoeffer to be a hopeful beginning for 'clearing the decks for the God of the Bible' because it means 'an abandonment of a false conception of God." (7, p. 509)

Samples of his theology are included in Appendix A.

Humanism

Humanism is a viewpoint which places prime importance on man and human values, and it is often considered the central theme of Renaissance civilization. Renaissance humanism can be traced to the 14th century Italian humanist, Petrarch, who is noted for having said, "Man is the measure of all things, of those that are, that they are, of those that are not, that they are not." When Socrates, a contemporary of Protagoras, turned from the study of physical nature as a means to dependable insight into intellectual and moral values, and looked instead to the study of man, he, too, exemplified the humanist trend. And, in all probability, these and other humanist leaders of the period were formulating the demand of their fellow men for a rational basis of belief and conduct in a time of widespread social confusion. Eventually, this movement encompassed Italy and all of western Europe. Though it gradually became linked to classroom studies of the classics, it more properly embraced any attitude exalting man's relationship to God, his free will, and his superiority over nature. Philosophically, humanism made man the measure of all things.

In man's personal quest for truth and goodness, humanism found inspiration. Systems of religious dogmas, philosophy, and abstract reasoning which were confining were shunned in favor of human values. Though tireless efforts were made to relate Christian thought to the philosophies of the ancient world, seeds were likewise sown for the flowering of Reformation thought.

A number of new humanisms took shape during the early years of the 20th century. One of these was the outgrowth of a consciously felt

necessity to bring scientific knowledge or technique and man's so-called "higher" needs and capacities into cooperative unity. William James, John Dewey and F. C. S. Schiller all made important contributions to this humanistic theory and practice. It was Schiller, in fact, who first used the term "humanism" as a technical philosophical term. In this philosophy, emphasis is put on the authenticity of the directly experienced world, the biological continuity of man with other living creatures, the relative nature of truth, beauty and goodness, and the importance of democratic institutions as instruments of moral and social advance.

Humanism has often, in recent years, been a term used to refer to value systems that emphasize the personal worth of each individual but that do not include a belief in God. The Unitarian Universalist Association has a certain segment within it that is nontheistic and yet uses religious forms to promote distinctive human value. In the same vein the 19th-century French positivist Auguste Comte established a nontheistic religion of humanity designed to promote social reform. The American Humanist Association publishes a quarterly magazine, The Humanism, and propagates the humanist point of view.

There is also a tendency among some Christian theologians to refer to Christianity as humanistic. Karl Barth, a noted 20th-century Swiss Protestant theologian, affirmed that "there is no humanism without the gospel." Also, Roman Catholic theologians have said that Catholic Christianity is humanistic in that it emphasizes the uniqueness of man as a being created in the image of God.

By liberating the latent potentialities of human nature, the humanist seeks to enrich and ennoble man's earthly life. Petrarch's words, "Man is the measure," always stand in some sense. Different answers to questions concerning the nature, the soul, and the proper endeavor of man have resulted in the contemporary division into Catholic and Protestant Humanism; Scientific or Naturalistic Humanism, adjusted in some cases to Freudian principles, but in general fashioned on a more ample design; and Classical Humanism, with its emphasis on "the great books."

Lloyd and Mary Morain write:

The American Humanist Association, with headquarters at Yellow Springs, Ohio, is the leading humanist organization in this country. It does vital educational work and is indispensable to the growth of the movement. There are more than forty groups which are affiliated with the A.H.A. in some manner or other. There are chapters, there are independent humanist fellowships, and there are study groups. In the Pacific Coast states John Danz has done much toward building several independent societies. Since the recent death of its remarkable leader C. G. Patterson, the Institute of Human Fellowship whose world headquarters was in Portland, Oregon, has merged with the A.H.A. The primary work of the Association is in meeting the desires and needs of individuals scattered throughout the country. (14, p. 39)

Orthodox Christianity

In some way or another, nearly 1,000,000,000 persons are identified with the Christian movement. Furthermore, the influence of Christianity extends well beyond the borders of Christendom. It has affected other religions, and its ethos continues to shape the character of individuals and nations that no longer live by its creed. By orthodox Christianity is meant that larger body of Christians who adhere in doctrine in some measure or another to the Nicene Creed, the most universal Christian confession.

Christianity is divided into two main bodies: Roman Catholicism and Protestantism. Roman Catholic doctrine has three distinctive doctrines that have achieved definitive formulation during the 19th and 20th centuries: the infallibility of the pope, the immaculate conception and bodily assumption of the Virgin Mary.

Protestantism is divided into four major doctrinal families: Lutheran, Anglican, Reformed and Free Church.

But the attention here is on that vast body of Christians who share to one extent or another in the historic Nicene Creed. These Christians encompass Protestant and Roman Catholic alike. And the attention is now turned to the beliefs which stem from the Creed.

Christianity rests upon divine revelation as a disclosure of God's ways with man seen in the history of Israel and of the church, but especially in Jesus Christ. With Judaism, Christianity believes that God is one and that He is the Creator of all things, present in His creation but not identical with it or captive to it. Man is the crown of God's creation and has been created in the very "image of God." Yet man's life fails to conform with the mind of God. Man has been alienated from the ground of his own being, has violated the law and righteousness of God, and is subject to the power of death. Man needs the grace of God to become again what he was intended to be, and this grace can break the power of death and give man a new birth. Through the incarnation of his son, Jesus Christ, God has granted men this grace. Jesus lived the life God intended humans to live. Jesus described the coming of God's reign and called men to cast away their old

ways and live by the will of God. The specific means of rescue and thus the climax in the earthly life of Christ was the cross. His death on the cross satisfied the law and righteousness of God, took away the power of death, and opened to men the possibility of living by the grace of God in the Kingdom of God. And his resurrection from death marked the end of the power of sin and death, the beginning of a new life. A very fine summary of this position is presented by Hugo Meynell as follows:

Man, who was created by God's sheer goodness for eternal happiness with God, has disobeyed him through his own fault. Having turned away from the unimaginably glorious and joyful destiny that God had prepared for him, man has become corrupt, to such an extent that he is quite incapable of recovery without God's help. To bring mankind back to him, God prepared a particular historical community to receive him, then comes among them as a man to live, die, and rise from the dead; leaving a band of men to preach the good news of the reconciliation of God and man, and in so doing to be the means of bringing man back to God and to the destiny for which he was created. Meanwhile, as the result of our original disobedience and the solution for it brought by the work of Jesus Christ, there is a struggle between the old and the new principles in every man. St. Paul dramatically describes, and the conflicts of Jesus with the demons in the gospels shows forth, the war within us between the old principle of disobedience and the new one of forgiveness and reconciliation. The goal of the whole process is the companionship between God and man in a renewed and purified world. (13, p. 4)

Some special emphasis must be given to the nature of man since, as will be explained later, this is a central concern in this study. The orthodox view is the belief that man's nature is corrupt, that he is prone to sin, that he, in fact, does sin and so stands in need of God's mercy and forgiveness. One author has said the reformers knew that if we looked at human virtue and merit, not from the ethical but from the strictly theocentric standpoint, all righteousness is as "filthy rags." There is none who is

righteous. Fallen and rebellious man is utterly impotent to come unaided to that saving knowledge of God for which he was created. He cannot bring his state into harmony with his true nature. He cannot fulfill the destiny for which he was created. (18, p. 43)

Unlike the animals man is a sinner; he falls below all earthly creatures in his rebellious denial of a responsibility which they can never know. . .the result is two-fold. First, alienation from God. Man is not at home in his Father's house, but a needy outcast in a far country. Second, the wrath of God, which is the terrible way this alienation works out, both for the individual and in society. (18, p. 45)

It is an assumption in this paper that the downfall of the new theology had much to do with the language of humanism which elevates man instead of God to a central position of importance. Since the issue of humanism is so central to the study, particular emphasis, as already suggested, will be given to the doctrine of man.

III. SIGNIFICANCE OF STUDY

A search for related studies proved to be futile. The Dissertation Abstracts were checked for the past ten year period and the ERIC Index was checked for the past seven years.

It is hoped that the study will be related to communication knowledge through reference to the Whorf hypothesis. The present author is considering the Whorf hypothesis to be relevant even though Christianity is not a different language. Its language, nevertheless, rests on a historical base. The Bible used most often dates back to the sixteenth century, and, in many churches, particularly the Penecostal churches, no other Bible is used.

About thirty years ago, Whorf, a linguist, compared the ways different languages express simple relations, such as "he is running" or "a light flashed," and concluded that differences in expression are associated with differences in cognition. Different linguistic communities, Whorf said, conceive of and experience the world differently, and they do so in part because they use different languages. It is the present author's belief that the church is a linguistic community. There is a very concise language with words like "incarnation" and "salvation" and "trinity" and "redemption" which are used no other place. The people who constitute the church use this language and know to what it refers. They find meaning and value in it or they would not be in the church. When someone comes along and tells the people in a community that their community is wrong about everything, they reject whoever does so because their language has influenced their perception of what the world can be. The people who are brought up in one community find it difficult to move to another or to see things in a new way. Writes Whorf:

For instance, if a race of people had the physiological defect of being able to see only the color blue, they would hardly be able to formulate the rule that they saw only blue. The term blue would convey no meaning to them, their language would lack color terms, and their words denoting their various sensations of blue would answer to, and translate, our words 'light, dark, white, black,' and so on, not our word 'blue.' In order to formulate the rule of norm of seeing only blue, they would need exceptional moments in which they saw other colors. (3, p. 69)

It is the contention of the present author that a system of language in the orthodox church controls thought. After years of training and conditioning, it is nigh to impossible to rid oneself of the language. . .and therefore of the thoughts. God is a very difficult word to get rid of.

It is central to one's experience in the orthodox church. The community so conditions one that it is hard, if not impossible, to accept the idea of no God. The author found this to be the case, not only with the new theology, but with the God is Dead movement. People simply could not grasp those words. They quite literally could not conceive of the idea.

A related idea of value to communication knowledge comes if we conceive the language clash between orthodox Christianity and the new theology through the "map territory" analogy. (3, p. 161) This simply states that the map is to the territory as language is to the non-verbal reality it represents. The author contends that nothing in the map, that is, the language, of the orthodox Christian, prepared him for the confrontation with the humanism in the new theology. A map is a chart of a territory, and, in this case, the territory was Christian orthodox theology. When the map is challenged, people become lost and insecure. They may panic and begin to fight. In other words, they become afraid. They defend and protect their map. And they may not even hear what is being said about the "new map." The new map may fail to find a home. And this appears to be the case when the new theology, with its high emphasis on humanism, came as a challenge to orthodox churches. Whorf writes:

Every normal person in the world, past infancy in years, can and does talk. By virtue of that fact, every person--civilized or uncivilized--carries through life certain naive but deeply rooted ideas about talking and its relation to thinking. Because of their firm connection with speech habits that have become unconscious and automatic, these notions tend to be rather intolerant of opposition. (3, p. 67)

This tolerance toward opposition is partly the way many orthodox Christians reacted to the new theology.

The importance of the study would hopefully be great for the church. Certainly, some understanding of what happened in this confrontation could help the church understand itself better. Whorf says, "We dissect nature along lines laid down by our native language" (3, p. 67), and it would be interesting to see if this is what the orthodox church did in its confrontation with the new theology.

IV. METHODOLOGY

The topic being dealt with in this paper is "the effects of the language of humanism, as expressed in the 'new theology,' on orthodox Christians." And the question under consideration, as previously stated, is, How do the language forms of orthodox Christianity, the new theology and humanism differ from one another?

To approach an understanding of the topic, the author has drawn what are considered to be necessary limits. Mainly, this study will center around the issue of the nature of man. It is felt that some of the sharpest differences between orthodox Christianity and humanism and the new theology center around this subject. It should be stated, however, that there are many other areas which also represent sharp differences.

For example, the orthodox Christian believes in immortality; neither the new theologians or the humanists do. The orthodox Christian believes in salvation, the doctrine that through faith in Christ one is assured of immortality. Obviously, since neither believe in immortality, this is not mentioned in humanism or the new theology. The Christian believes in

prayer as a vital force in life and as a one-to-one conversation with God. The new theology recasts the whole meaning of prayer into a person-to-person encounter characterized by depth. This is NOT prayer to the orthodox Christian. One speaks directly to God.

As a matter of fact, the new theologians attempted to change the very definition of religious. To most orthodox Christians, being religious definitely includes specific acts and rituals, such as going to church. The new theologians approach it this way:

Perhaps the best way to define 'religious' would be to ask, for instance, what is the difference between a religious film and a Christian film. Most people would without thinking tend to equate the two. But clearly there is an important distinction to be made. A Christian film is one that embodies Christian personal relationships, Christian insights, into the purpose and meaning of life. A religious film is one that is about a certain area of experience or activity. It could have a Biblical or quasi-biblical subject, it could be about nuns, or Lourdes, or centre round some religious movement or experience. It is possible for the former category to have nothing specifically to do with religion at all, while the latter, we know, can be nauseatingly and profoundly unchristian. (15, p. 84)

Although these are issues which separate the three schools of thought, the focus of attention in this study will be on the nature of man.

One primary tool will be used to conduct the study. The tool will consist of three illustrative tables of belief, expressed in the language of representative authors, one for humanism, one for the new theology, and one for orthodox Christians. It is from these tables that language comparisons will be drawn. The tables are set up from three books, one for each of the three schools under consideration. The book for the new theology is Honest to God by Robinson, the book for humanism is Humanism

as the Next Step by Lloyd and Mary Morain, and the book for orthodox Christianity is A Firm Faith for Today by Harold Bosley. The excerpts chosen from the books to form the tables are selected on the basis of their relevancy to the doctrine of man, either stated or implied.

The study will include an analysis of the rhetoric based on the literature which can be found in the appendix. A variety of linguistic indicators will be used in making the evaluation. They are divided into two categories: those based on form and those based on content. These indicators are combinations of words which give us insight into the author's viewpoint and prejudices. They are as follows:

Based on Form

1. The use of the question.

Definition: The question is put in such a way as to imply the answer.

Example: "But suppose such a super-Being 'out there' is really only a sophisticated version of the Old Man in the sky?"

2. The implication of agreement from the reader.

Definition: The statement implies that the reader is in agreement.

Example: "It will soon be as impossible for an intelligent, educated man or woman to believe in a god as it is not to believe that the earth is flat, that flies can be spontaneously generated, that disease is a divine punishment, or that death is always due to witchcraft. Gods will doubtless survive, sometimes under the protection of vested interests, or in the shelter of lazy minds, or as puppets used by politicians, or as refugees for unhappy and ignorant souls."

3. The use of humor.

Definition: Humor is used to embellish the point being made.

Example: "Here God is the supreme Being, the grand Architect, who exists somewhere out beyond the world--like a rich aunt in Australia--who started it all going, periodically intervenes in its running, and generally gives evidence of his benevolent interest in it."

4. The use of the either/or statement.

Definition: The either/or statement is employed to polarize the reader and to force him into a decision.

Example: "We must either be the best generation, morally and spiritually speaking, that this old world has ever seen, or we will be the last one."

5. The use of abstract language.

Definition: Language which is obscure and the meaning of which is unclear.

Example: "God, lillich was saying, is not a projection 'out there', an Other beyond the skies, of whose existence we have to convince ourselves, but the Ground of our very being."

6. The use of concrete language.

Definition: Language which is clear and easily understood.

Example: "That depth is what the word God means. And if that word has not much meaning for you, translate it, and speak of the depths of your life, of the source of your being, of your ultimate concern, of what you take seriously without any reservation."

7. A strong dramatic quality.

Definition: Words and phrases are used to provide a profound, colorful effect; has a strong emotional content.

Example: "You ask, 'What difference does it make whether there is an actual return to religion?' I reply, 'The difference it has always made! All the difference between life and death for all that we hold dear in our civilization!' Consider the desperate spiritual plight of the modern world and you will understand the dire need for a real return to religion."

Based on Content

8. The devaluation of religion.

Definition: The statement devaluated the importance of religion.

Example: "But suppose men come to feel that they can get along perfectly well without 'religion,' without any desire for personal salvation, without any sense of sin, without any need of 'that hypothesis?'"

9. A here-and-now orientation vs. an invisible after world.

Definition: The emphasis is on this world and this life as opposed to a future after world and after life.

Example: "Humanists are content with fixing their attention on this life and on this earth."

10. An emphasis on the invisible after world.

Definition: The emphasis is on a future after world and after life instead of this world and this life.

Example: "All Christian creedal formulations, ancient and modern, affirm faith in immortality."

11. A God-less orientation.

Definition: An orientation in which the existence of God is viewed as an unimportant issue or is denied altogether.

Example: "But any notion that God really exists 'out there' must be dismissed: 'gods are peripheral phenomena produced by evolution.'"

12. A God-centered orientation.

Definition: God's existence is viewed as real and as of vital significance.

Example: "There need be no hesitation in affirming that belief in God is the basic belief of the Christian faith."

13. An emphasis on the dignity of man.

Definition: Man's basic worth is affirmed.

Example: "Another humanist pioneer, Charles Francis Potter, defines humanism as, 'Faith in the supreme self-perfectibility of the human personality.'"

14. The emphasis on love as supreme value.

Definition: Love is held out as the most important of all values.

Example: "To believe in God as love means to believe that in pure personal relationship we encounter, not merely what ought to be, but what is, the deepest, veriest truth about the structure of reality."

15. An existential orientation.

Definition: Man is viewed as the creator of his own meaning.

Example: "When you have arrived at the humanist perspective of life, fully realizing that in all the universe there is no concern for man excepting man's concern for himself, no meaning to life except the meaning which man himself gives to life, no reason or excuse for existence except the meaning which man himself gives to life, no reason or excuse for existence except the possibility that man can make existence worth while--when you have that perspective, that realization, then there comes to you an urgency to do everything you can to make your life more meaningful, more joyous, more worthwhile."

16. Judgemental vs. descriptive.

Definition: The statement renders a judgement (e.g., good-bad, right-wrong) instead of merely explaining its meaning.

Example: "Humanism is free from such divisive doctrines about the unknown, deity, revelation, sacred scriptures, rituals, sacraments, formal theology, and such befuddling ideas as the radical separation of either the world or the individual into matter and spirit."

17. Interpersonal emphases.

Definition: There is an emphasis on the importance of men's relationships to each other.

Example: "The humanist seeks the life abundant for his neighbor as for himself."

18. An appreciation for nature.

Definition: Nature is valued for its capacity to help man live a good life.

Example: "As men study their environment, it becomes more and more predictable and less and less frightening. As men understand and cooperate with nature they flourish."

19. An emphasis on the helplessness of man.

Definition: Man is viewed as dependent upon God for the fulfillment of his needs.

Example: "Jesus Christ is God's supreme effort to waken us to our utter and complete dependence upon His will for us and for all mankind."

20. Words which are unique to a thought system.

Definition: Words are used which are not found elsewhere or they are used in some unique context.

Example: "salvation" "trinity" "judgement"

This methodology included four basic steps, and these are as follows:

1. Setting the literary excerpts off into numbered units.
2. Devising a set of linguistic indicators. This was accomplished, partly by surveying the literature to see what was there and partly by hypothesizing what characteristics one would expect to find in religious literature.
3. Counting the units, using the linguistic indicators as the measure.
4. Inferring meanings of the messages based on the count obtained for the various units.

This approach is basically the method of what is called "content analysis." This method is so important to this study that some of its major principles are herein set forth.

Of central concern to the approach of content analysis is the drawing of inferences. Thomas Carney, in a book entitled Content Analysis, says, "Nobody can argue from a communication to its effects without making inferences. . . . In fact, it is precisely this concern which distinguishes content analysis from an index, a concordance or a precise." (2, p. 5) With this thinking as his basis, Carney defines content analysis as follows:

Content analysis is any technique for making inferences by objectively and systematically identifying specified characteristics of messages. (2, p. 5)

It should be clear from this definition that there are various ways of going about content analysis, but all have in common the end product of making inferences possible. Carney undergirds the importance of this when he writes:

Content analysis is a technique which aims to improve the quality of the inferences we make. It is based on analyzing communications, be they verbal, written or even pictorial. It analyzes by objectively and systematically picking out characteristics in specified parts of those communications. And it involves demonstrating how these characteristics are related to our inferences. (2, p. xv)

Alexander George, writing in Trends in Content Analysis by de Sola Pool, gives emphasis and validity to Carney's reasoning when he says: "The investigator examines the communication for clues to the speaker's intention and other aspects of his state of mind. In brief, content analysis is employed as a diagnostic tool for making specific inferences about some aspect of the speaker's purposive behavior." (4, p. 7)

As has been pointed out, one of the major steps followed in this paper, as set forth in point four, was the drawing of inferences. But this was not done in a completely subjective way. The inferences drawn were based on the count obtained for the various units in the literary excerpts, so that the count served as a guide for drawing the inferences.

This form of content analysis, the one employed in this paper, is known as "quantitative content analysis." It is concerned, as George points out, with "the frequency of occurrence of given content characteristics; that is, the investigator works with the frequency of occurrence of certain content characteristics." (4, p. 9) The content characteristics in this paper were called linguistic indicators. Quantitative content analysis

is, in the first place, a statistical technique for obtaining descriptive data on content variables. Its value in this respect is that it offers the possibility of obtaining more precise, objective, and reliable observations about the frequency with which given content characteristics occur either singly or in conjunction with one another. As George puts it, "the quantitative approach substitutes controlled observation and systematic counting for impressionistic ways of observing frequencies of occurrence." (4, p. 8)

Devising the linguistic indicators is a difficult part of this process, and some special attention will now be given to this particular matter. As previously stated, this was done partly by surveying the literature to see what was there. This is sound procedure. George writes: "A familiar prerequisite of quantitative content analysis is that the investigator know what he is looking for before beginning to count." (4, p. 9) This involves some degree of familiarity with the literature. George continues by saying, ". . . categories of analysis should be related to the structure of the material under discussion. . . what one counts needs to have some relation to the structure of the piece examined." (4, p. 9) This, again, demands some familiarity with the literature before the linguistic indicators are devised, and it also demands that the indicators have some close relationship to the literature being analyzed.

Content analysis does not call for a totally objective approach. For example, the investigator's understanding of the literature plays an important role throughout the process. George puts it this way:

But such tabulations in themselves give no clue to the meaning of the content in question. They are of value, therefore, only when the investigator has prior or independent knowledge of their meaning, role, and significance in the system of language habits under study. (4, p. 10)

Another term for the basic method used in this paper is "frequency analysis." Counts which were consistently high or consistently low were looked to with special interest for the inferences which were drawn. A frequency content indicator is one in which the number of times one or more content characteristics occur is regarded as relevant for purposes of inference. George says, ". . . frequency analysis, even when it deals with dichotomous attributes, always singles out frequency distributions as a basis for making inferences." (4, p. 10)

Finally, in the form of content analysis employed herein, situational aspects of the literature are taken into important account. George writes:

In order to interpret the precise meaning intended by the speaker in any individual instance he takes into account the purpose or objective which the specific communication is designed to achieve. In taking into account the situational context of the communication being analyzed the investigator considers who is speaking, to whom, and under what circumstances. The investigator also takes into account the time and place of the communication and related events preceding or accompanying it. (4, pp. 27-28)

V. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Bishop Robinson's book, Honest to God, constitutes the major source for looking into the various beliefs and positions in the theological movement that has been designated "the new theology." The bishop wrote the book while he was ill and had time on his hands. He says he simply jotted down a number of things that had made sense to him over the years but which he had not previously recorded. The book has about it the earmarks of an anthology or diary. There are many, many quotations from other authors, particularly Paul Tillich and Dietrich Bonhoeffer.

Commenting on this book, Hugo Meynell said,

The Bishop of Woolwich's books which I referred to (including Honest to God) are sufficiently typical of the new reformers to provide instances of their characteristic virtues and vices. . . . Honest to God made many Christians of impeccable but rather unexciting orthodoxy consider their beliefs in a new light, and reflect on the effect of their religion on the whole of their moral and intellectual make-up. (10, p. 7)

In regard to what he called the "outcry" which greeted the publication of Honest to God, Meynell comments:

The trouble was, not that these things were being said at all--theologians had been saying them for a century in this country and for a century and a half in Germany, in profound and forbidding volumes, inaccessible to any but the most intrepid layman--but that they were being said in a language people could understand. Since Honest to God, the chaotic situation in theology has not only existed--God knows this is no new state of affairs--but has been universally known to exist. (10, p. 3)

Bishop Robinson is a bishop in the Church of England. His book, which was published in the 60's, sold in excess of one million copies, a remarkable record in the field of religious publishing.

The major source for looking into the position of humanism is Humanism as the Next Step written by Lloyd and Mary Morain. The book carefully enunciates most of the major tenets of humanism and suggests humanism as a philosophy should be man's next choice.

Lloyd Morain, president of the American Humanist Association, studied under Alfred Korzybski, Bertrand Russell, and Hans Reichenbach. A former personnel consultant, he was, at the time the book was published, a personal business advisor in San Francisco and a director of twelve industrial, public utility, and financial corporations.

His wife, Mary Morain, is a director of the International Humanist and Ethical Union. Holder of a master's degree in political science from the University of Chicago, she has been both a social worker and a college teacher and has served as a vice-president of the League of Women Voters of Boston and of the Planned Parenthood League of Massachusetts.

Finally, the major source for the section on orthodox Christianity is Harold Bosley's A Firm Faith for Today. Dr. Bosley is a renowned Methodist minister who served the Methodist Church in Evanston, Illinois and then went to Christ's Church, New York, following the retirement of Dr. Ralph Sockman from that pulpit. There Dr. Bosley ministers today. He is well-known for his involvement in Christian social affairs and for his active participation in the World Council of Churches and the National Council of Churches. His book, drawing upon several of the important and historic creeds in Christianity, attempts to touch nearly all of the major Christian doctrines such as God, Jesus Christ, the Holy Spirit, the Bible, the church,

man, the forgiveness of sin, reconciliation, the kingdom of God, salvation and immortality.

VI. DEFINITION OF TERMS

The new theology, a movement within the churches during the 1960's, represents an attempt to secularize Christianity and to destroy the image of a person-God.

Humanism is a philosophical expression of the belief that man is the highest value in existence.

Orthodox Christianity refers to the traditional expression of the Christian faith which has roots in one degree or another to the Nicene Creed.

CHAPTER II

ANALYSIS OF THE LITERATURE

I. THE NEW THEOLOGY

Table 1

The New Theology

<u>Linguistic Indicators Based on Form</u>	<u>No. of Times Used</u>
1. The use of the question. Example: Appendix A, Item 1	8
2. The implication of agreement from the reader. Example: Appendix A, Item 10	9
3. The use of humor. Example: Appendix A, Item 10	6
4. The use of the either/or statement	none
5. The use of abstract language. Example: Appendix A, Item 3	4
6. The use of concrete language. Example: Appendix A, Item 15	17
7. A strong dramatic quality. Example: Appendix A, Item 10	3
<u>Linguistic Indicators Based on Content</u>	
8. The devaluation of religion. Example: Appendix A, Item 4	5

Table 1 (continued)

<u>Linguistic Indicators Based on Content</u>	<u>No. of Times Used</u>
9. A here-and-now orientation vs. an invisible after-world.	none
10. An emphasis on the invisible after-world.	none
11. A God-less orientation. Example: Appendix A, Item 8	13
12. A God-centered orientation.	none
13. An emphasis on the dignity of man. Example: Appendix A, Item 2	2
14. The emphasis on love as supreme value. Example: Appendix A, Item 15	8
15. An existential orientation. Example: Appendix A, Item 1	8
16. Judgemental vs. descriptive. Example: Appendix A, Item 10	4
17. Interpersonal emphases. Example: Appendix A, Item 17	9
18. An appreciation for nature. Example: Appendix A, Item 8	1
19. An emphasis on the helplessness of man.	none
20. Words which are unique to a thought system.	none

The rhetoric of the new theology implies over and over that the "God of our fathers" is dead. Many linguistic indicators are employed to make this rather important point, but the most noticable is the question. Questions are not answered but are put in such a way as to imply an answer. The questions attempt to persuade the reader into agreement, as much as to say "of course, this is so," or, "certainly, this has to be false." Bishop Robinson asks: "But suppose there is no Being out there at all? Suppose, to use our analogy, the skies are empty?" The implications are clear. There IS no Being out there and, indeed, the skies ARE empty. This is but one example of an indicator used many, many times.

Whether or not the God of our fathers is dead or not is a theological question which need not concern us in any detail here. What is of concern is that a great host of Christians do not think so! The new theologians seem to take no cognizance of this fact. In their rhetoric, they write as though every reader is right there with them, feeling and thinking as they do. They imply as much many times over. They state outright that all "intelligent" persons will see things "this way." Only the lazy, only the ignorant will go on thinking otherwise. No one, they claim, believes in a God "up there" anymore; we have made the transition to a God "out there." Have we? Who is "we?" Doubtless there are people who have abandoned the God in the skies, and doubtless there are countless numbers who HAVE NOT. The new theologians seemed to imply in their writing that we stand on the very edge of one of the most momentous

theological revolutions ever to strike mankind, but time has proven them to be wrong. Now, some fifteen years after they did their work, a mood of conservatism has struck the churches which is profound, and nowhere is there any sign that mankind has lived through a theological revolution.

The rhetoric of humor is yet another indicator employed frequently by the new theologians. God is compared to a rich aunt somewhere in Australia. Those who do not have the new theological insights are called "flat earthers". It is said that God is beginning to resemble not a ruler "but the last fading smile of a cosmic Cheshire Cat." It is doubtful if this approach did much to "win friends and influence people." Beliefs are precious, and the beliefs which the new theologians make fun over are still very real to a great many people. It is probably not too exaggerated to call this approach "the rhetoric of insult." Consider, for example, the words of Julian Huxley when he writes: "It will soon be as impossible for an intelligent, educated man or woman to believe in god as it is not to believe that the earth is flat, that flies can be spontaneously generated, that disease is a divine punishment, or that death is always due to witchcraft." How will those words be taken by people who DO believe in God? And is that really so impossible as Mr. Huxley's rhetoric implies? No. There is no evidence that a massive atheist onslaught has won many millions of people. And what are we to say of such people? Well, let us see what Mr. Huxley says of them. "Gods will doubtless survive, sometimes under the protection of vested interests, or in the shelter of lazy minds, or as puppets used by politicians, or as refugees for unhappy and ignorant souls."

The only people to whom this rhetoric will have appeal are those who have already embraced the atheist position. If the new theology did not set well with the church, it had much to do with this kind of rhetoric. Indeed, the new theologians make no effort to set forth any sociological framework to undergird their writing. And their rhetoric calls for this. They imply "many feel this way and many feel that way" but they never support their claims with real figures or real sociological insights. Who is with them and who is against them? They imply much about this question but prove little.

Nothing less than scare tactics emerge when the new theologians take after the need to abandon religion. Once again, they buttress their position by making it clear only the "weak" will object. But that stance is being questioned. Is it logical that everyone who finds religion meaningful and helpful must be termed basically "weak?" This hardly seems logical. And there is a rather sizeable mass of people in the world who see religion as necessary and important, who feel it must be in the culture for a stable, moral world to exist. How do such people feel when someone comes along saying we must get rid of religion? They would feel angry, upset, and possibly frightened, for such a proposal destroys the very groundwork of the blueprint for a better world.

The upshot of this analysis is that the new theology was not very kind to orthodox Christianity. Doubtless there were Christians quite ready for this kind of viewpoint; and doubtless there were a great many more who were not.

The new theologians seem to encourage a polarization among their readers. "Either you agree with me or you are not particularly smart." The implication is just that striking. The rhetoric seems to be saying, "All the intelligent people are on our side." There is even a pitying tone for those who haven't yet "seen the light" and an impatient admission that "we must do something for these poor souls." This process involved a judgement that at times overrides the more important work of evaluation.

Remembering that the new theology is a movement within Christianity, it is strange that some of the most historic and important doctrines are altogether ignored. The most striking example of this would be immortality and the doctrine of "last things." This is literally never mentioned by the new theologians. It would be one thing if they denied its truth, but they do not. They simply ignore it. This would be an obvious oversight in the minds of many Christians, and one of real disappointment. The new theology centers upon the mortal world, the here-and-now, and says nothing of an invisible, after-world. This makes the rhetoric of the new theology seem incomplete, as though something of vast importance is missing altogether, and, indeed, it is! A completed, systematic theology could hardly ignore the subject of death and final things.

The overriding tone of new theology rhetoric is clearly humanistic. God is brought down to nothing. There is no being-God. Bonhoeffer comes closest to referring to a God but quickly explains God is weak and powerless. This, says Bonhoeffer, is the only way God can help us, though the author does not explain this in any clear way. The upshot is to reason

that man must stand on his own. He is not going to receive any help at all from a God in the heavens. Prayer will not help; prayer is simply intense involvement with another human being. The point of worship is to make us more sensitive to the needs of the world. Our attention is directed to our need to stand on our own two feet and be fully human. If we do this, the implication is that we will have no need for a God. Those who do have this need are lazy or weak or stupid. Man must therefore be fully man. God is called "Ultimate Reality," "depth" and "the ground of our being." Tillich, who used the last phrase, never clarified what this meant. But one thing is sure and needs no argument: the new theology has a vision of God which crushes out orthodox thought. Man is hopeless except for the help he can give himself and the help he can secure from other human beings. But the implication is that man need not "need" in the traditional sense of that word. His need which depends upon a God can be satisfied in other ways. To think otherwise is to miss the truth of man's nature. Writes Tillich: "perhaps after all the Freudians are right, that such a God--the God of traditional popular theology--is a projection in any form."

As has already been suggested, new theology rhetoric is a bit abstract at points. It is strange that Tillich never fully explained his concept of "the ground of our being," but the truth is, he did not. And that leaves us with a somewhat abstract concept on our hands. On the other hand, the real brilliance of new theology rhetoric lies in its adroit ability at times to turn the abstract into the concrete. Tillich's

concept of God as depth is a good example. Here, he explains with many metaphors exactly what he means, and it is hard to believe anyone would be in the dark if they read all Tillich says on this issue. The language is at times so concrete it leaves nothing to the imagination. For the most part, the new theologians honestly tried to make themselves clear. They did this through metaphors and other comparisons.

This rhetoric lifts up love as the supreme value in the universe. This, again, is highly humanistic. We need no moral laws, for example, only love in our hearts. If we do what love dictates, it will be right. If we do what it denies, we will do wrong. The scriptural statement that "God is love" is lifted up as paramount to any understanding of God. But here, too, we find a limitation. God is love but Bishop Robinson finds it impossible to say love is God. Yet he does not say what "more-than-love" God is.

In chapter 4, an effort will be made to contrast the rhetoric of the new theology with that of humanism and orthodox Christianity. Perhaps in that way further light can be shed on its own rhetoric.

II. HUMANISM

Table 2

Humanism

<u>Linguistic Indicators Based on Form</u>	<u>No. of Times Used</u>
1. The use of the question.	none
2. The implication of agreement from the reader.	none
3. The use of humor.	none
4. The use of the either/or statement.	none
5. The use of abstract language.	6
Example: Appendix B, Item 10	
6. The use of concrete language.	19
Example: Appendix B, Item 3	
7. A strong dramatic quality.	5
Example: Appendix B, Item 2	
<u>Linguistic Indicators Based on Content</u>	
8. The devaluation of religion.	6
Example: Appendix B, Item 3	
9. A here-and-now orientation vs. an invisible after-world.	7
Example: Appendix B, Item 2	
10. An emphasis on the invisible after-world.	none
11. A God-less orientation.	4
Example: Appendix B, Item 9	
12. A God-centered orientation.	none

Table 2 (continued)

<u>Linguistic Indicators Based on Content</u>	<u>No. of Times Used</u>
13. An emphasis on the dignity of man. Example: Appendix B, Item 9	13
14. The emphasis on love as supreme value.	none
15. An existential orientation. Example: Appendix B, Item 30	6
16. Judgemental vs. descriptive. Example: Appendix B, Item 3	6
17. Interpersonal emphases. Example: Appendix B, Item 4	11
18. An appreciation for nature. Example: Appendix B, Item 24	4
19. An emphasis on the helplessness of man.	none
20. Words which are unique to a thought system.	none

Perhaps the most striking feature of humanistic rhetoric is its "here-and-now" orientation. There is neither interest in or concern for any other world beyond this one. As the Morains put it, "Humanists are content with fixing their attention on this life and this earth." There is no particular emphasis on either denying or affirming an after-life. The emphasis is on stating that this is an altogether unimportant matter. This world is all we know, and it is this world which must receive our

attention. This view gives a certain urgency to life. Since it may be all we know, we must make the most of it. This comes through almost as an ethical imperative, as though man has the moral obligation to make the most of life that he can. We hear this reflected in these words: "If this is the only life we can be sure of, let us make it a worthy one." And this note of urgency bears down on our relationship to others. "If we believe there will be no second chance in a future life to make up to family, friends, and acquaintances for the difficulties and unhappiness which we cause them, and if we believe there is no future of bliss for them but that this life we share is all they will ever know, it becomes crucial that we do what we can to make this existence a happy one." The rhetoric implies there is a certain relief in being rid of after life considerations. Man is now free to spend all his energies and attentions on this earthly existence, and this frees him for a better chance at having a good life.

This leads to the observation that humanistic rhetoric has at times a distinctly existential flavor. Note that the authors state, "The spiritual meaning of life is that which we give to it." If life is to have meaning, man must create it for himself in this given moment of time. Alfred E. Smith stresses this theme when he writes:

When you have arrived at the humanist perspective of life, fully realizing that in all the universe there is no concern for man excepting man's concern for himself, no meaning to life except the meaning which man himself gives to life, no reason or excuse for existence except the possibility that man can make existence worth while--when you have that perspective, that realization, then there comes to you an urgency to do everything you can to make your life more meaningful, more joyous, more worthwhile.

And this leads to the further observation that humanistic rhetoric is atheistic. There is no deity who helps us or to whom we owe anything. This rhetoric is concrete rather than abstract, for it discards ways of worship, rituals, symbols and sacraments and boasts doing so. This discarding is done in the name of a hope for uniting all men. This rhetoric is non-judgemental as is illustrated when the Morains write:

Humanism is free from divisive doctrines about the unknown, free from rituals and ceremonies and liturgical regulations which so often separate people and set them apart from each other. There is no damnation, no purgatory, no heaven, no mystical realms or essences. Humanism is concerned with life on this wonderful earth of ours.

This same optimism characterizes the discarding of the God idea. This is not seen as a loss but as a gain, a gain which frees men to build a better world now. "Religion without a supernatural element becomes meaningful and personal." It has even been argued that the loss of the God idea gives a certain note of nobility to man. "Men, like all other living things, must rely upon themselves, upon one another and upon nature." This note of self-reliance is extremely important to an understanding of humanist rhetoric. It stresses again and again the theme of man's freedom from external constraints, religion being but one example. Erich Fromm wrote, "We are to look for strength not outside ourselves but within." Man is called on to act in the world, not to be passive or to sit about waiting for a god to do something. Write the Morains, "We hold in high regard the scientific method--the constant search for information and the willingness to change opinions as facts warrant. . . There is no evidence

that (men) receive support or guidance from any immaterial power with whom they are presumed to commune."

Is man up to this? Or to put it another way, does humanism give us a realistic appraisal of man's worth and capabilities? Every single one of the world's great organized religions would say no. The reality of sin, for example, is not dealt with anywhere in the humanistic rhetoric. Even certain branches of modern-day psychiatry might look askance at humanism, for it omits some of the realistic neuroticisms and psychoses that cripple man's effort to be noble.

Nevertheless, right or wrong, humanist rhetoric lifts man up as the highest value there is and of whom there is none greater. This is another central theme of this rhetoric, and it demands attention. Charles Francis Potter puts it this way: "Faith in the supreme self-perfectibility of the human personality" is a definition of humanism. And John Herman Randall, Jr., states: "And there is the humanist hope 'involving the triumphant apotheosis of man, the creator and builder.'" The Morains come directly to the point: "The supreme value is the individual human being." Clearly, and without dispute, humanistic rhetoric, if anything, is man-centered. Perhaps this is nowhere stated as eloquently as it is by Harold Rafton who, when asked if he believed in a supreme being, replied, "Emphatically yes, and that supreme being is man."

Not even the theme of man's relation to other men is as emphatic as this one. But there is some emphasis on inter-personal relations and it should be noted. "Humanism is a philosophy of men's relations to one another and to nature, rather than of men's relations to deity."

"Happiness and self-fulfillment for oneself and others are richly sufficient life goals." Humanists find real value in the life of Jesus, not in any supernatural sense, but in the sense that his teachings were concerned "with human relations and with the daily practice of the social virtues." And certainly there is a strong world-concern. Cooperation with nature must be performed in the name of brotherhood. Science must be pursued for the welfare of all men. "Humanism is concerned that through intelligent cooperation men live a good life and lessen poverty, war, disease and prejudice."

Having said all this, it should be noted once again that the humanist rhetoric deals more with the fulfillment of the individual than with interpersonal concerns. In fact, humanism claims to have a religion, and when we understand that religion, we are again aware how vital to the rhetoric is the nobility and importance of individual man. "John Dewey describes religious attitudes as basically a thoroughgoing and deep-seated harmonizing of the self with the universe. And he further defines religious experience as that which has the power to bring about a deeper and more enduring adjustment to life." John Dietrich states that religion is "the upreaching and aspiring impulse in a human life. It is life striving for its completest fulfillment, and anything which contributes to this fulfillment is religious, whether it be associated with the idea of God or not."

Finally, it is important to note in humanist rhetoric its praise for nature. Man is not dependent upon any God, but to some extent he is

dependent upon the ways of nature. Man should embrace nature as his friend and cooperate with it to bring about a happier world. "As men study their environment, it becomes more and more predictable and less and less frightening. As men understand and cooperate with nature they flourish."

III. ORTHODOX CHRISTIANITY

Table 3

Orthodox Christianity

<u>Linguistic Indicators Based on Form</u>	<u>No. of Times Used</u>
1. The use of the question. Example: Appendix C, Item 1	1
2. The implication of agreement from the reader.	none
3. The use of humor.	none
4. The use of the either/or statement. Example: Appendix C, Item 2	5
5. The use of abstract language. Example: Appendix C, Item 9	14
6. The use of concrete language. Example: Appendix C, Item 2	19
7. A strong dramatic quality. Example: Appendix C, Item 1	6
<u>Linguistic Indicators Based on Content</u>	
8. The devaluation of religion.	none
9. A here-and-now orientation vs. an invisible after-world.	none

Table 3 (continued)

<u>Linguistic Indicators Based on Content</u>	<u>No. of Times Used</u>
10. An emphasis on the invisible after-world.	5
11. A God-less orientation.	none
12. A God-centered orientation.	21
Example: Appendix C, Item 4	
13. An emphasis on the dignity of man.	none
14. The emphasis on love as supreme value.	3
Example: Appendix C, Item 8	
15. An existential orientation.	none
16. Judgemental vs. descriptive.	7
Example: Appendix C, Item 6	
17. Interpersonal emphases.	1
Example: Appendix C, Item 10	
18. An appreciation for nature.	none
19. An emphasis on the helplessness of man.	9
Example: Appendix C, Item 16	
20. Words which are unique to a thought system.	25
Example: Appendix C, Item 6	

The over-all tone of orthodox rhetoric is highly dramatic, probably more than is true of either the new theology or humanism. The orthodox rhetorician strikes for emphasis at any number of points, and

colors his statements with resounding words that catch the attention.

As an example of this process, let us take the first statement from the table of beliefs and underline those words or phrases which give dramatic emphasis.

You ask, "What difference does it make whether there is actual return to religion?" I reply, "The difference it has always made! All the difference between life and death for all that we hold dear in our civilization!" Consider the desperate spiritual plight of the modern world and you will understand the dire need for a real return to religion.

It might be noted that half of the sentences end in exclamation points.

This dramatic form of rhetoric is given further emphasis by use of either/or statements which come fairly often. There is little middle ground in orthodox rhetoric. Little choice is given the reader. "Either we do it this way or we are doomed," seems to be the tone of the rhetoric. As an example, take this second statement from the table of beliefs, underlining this time the either/or phrases:

We must either be the best generation, morally and spiritually speaking, that this old world has ever seen, or we will be the last one. We must either rise to heights of personal and social living that heretofore men have either only dreamed of or talked about as some summum bonum to be reached if and when the millennium should come, or be prepared to face the very great probability that the curtain of history will drop on man and all his works in our own lifetime.

This kind of rhetoric carries with it an implied polarization. "Either you are with us or against us." It is interesting to note, however, that the rhetoric remains at a fairly abstract level and lacks concreteness.

For example, there is talk of "the desperate spiritual plight of the modern

world" but no explanation whatsoever as to the character of this plight. What does it consist of? Where do we find evidence of it? Questions like these go unanswered. The writer seeks, or so it seems, to provoke a certain element of fear in his reader, but he never puts any content to this fear. He attempts to stir the reader by rhetoric alone. To put it bluntly, he seldom attempts to prove his point.

It is in this rhetoric that we find a very traditional language and one that is uniquely Christian. Let us look at some of the words in this rhetoric which we found in neither of the previous ones or certainly not often. They include: "millinennium," "heresy," "faith," "judgement," "sin," "redeemed," "renewed," "radiant," "trinity," "Holy Spirit," "salvation," "believers," "paradise," "heaven," "hell," "church," "Bible," "rebellion," "gospel," "forgiveness," "Kingdom of God," "deliverance," "death," "grace," and "revelation." These words tend to form a distinctly Christian vocabulary. In the rhetoric of orthodoxy, such words are used with familiarity, as though they need no definition but will naturally be understood by the reader.

For another feature of orthodox rhetoric, one need only turn to the Nicene Creed and certain other statements in the table of beliefs to find a distinctly other-worldly orientation. The rhetoric points the reader toward heaven and immortality. There are repeated references to the end of time. And there is within this emphasis a decided element of fear, fear of the final judgement and of one's outcome after death. The

Nicene Creed warns us, "He shall come again with glory, to judge both the quick and the dead. . ." Related to this matter, it might here be appropriate to point out that the rhetoric stresses man as sinner and as in dire need of divine forgiveness and grace. Why a Jesus Christ? The author, in part, answers this way: "He is God's supreme effort to sting us into realizing the true extent of the poverty of our lives apart from God. He is God's supreme effort to save us from ourselves, from the evil of undisciplined and insubordinate passion and pride; from the evil of ignorant and brutal ways; from callous indifference to the needs and rights of our brothers; and from the horror of their inexorable vengeance." And continuing a bit further we find these words: "But man is a sinner; he is in open rebellion against God. He has taken full advantage of his freedom to follow his own undisciplined desires and prejudices. Consequently, all that he does is steeped in sin, i.e., savors of his rebellion against God."

Only God can come to our rescue. And here we find still another characteristic of orthodox rhetoric: it is highly God-centered! The author writes: "There need be no hesitation in affirming that belief in God is the basic belief of the Christian faith." This is no God who, like the deist's God, does nothing. He is an active God who enters into life on behalf of men and the world. He does much. "God is this deep and abiding meaningfulness of life; God is this essential togetherness of values; God is this unalterable definiteness in life in terms of which life finds purpose and meaning; God is love; God is the peace that passeth

all understanding. To say that we believe in God, then, is to say that we believe it is possible for us to find the purpose of our life in His Purpose for life, to find the strength for fulfilling that purpose in His strong Presence within us yet always beyond us. To believe in God is to seek to lose our life in His that we may find it again--redeemed, renewed, and made radiant with his love." And man is totally dependent upon this God. Without Him, man can never find his way to a meaningful existence. Only as man lives within God's life does he find peace.

Jesus, says the writer, "is God's supreme effort to sting us into realizing the true extent of the poverty of our lives apart from God." The emphasis on a Jesus-centered rhetoric goes hand in hand with the God-centered emphasis. Jesus is far more than a great ethical leader. He is the doorway to salvation, the path to God, the revelation of God's nature as it can be seen in this world. The name of Jesus Christ is "high and lifted up" in orthodox rhetoric, and it is but a breath away from the name of God Himself. "Jesus continues to be 'Son of God and Son of man,' the one in whom we have our clearest revelation of God's will for man, the one in whom we see God's will for human life exalted and glorified."

Finally, it should be noted that the rhetoric of orthodoxy is highly moralistic. Ethics are not left to chance, to one's good judgment, or even to love as the compass. "The crowning error of moral and ethical relationships is the idea that what I think is right is right for me, and what you think is right is right for you. This is simply not

true." Morals center around the laws and will of God, and the path to morality is narrow. "Manifestly, when you study order and growth through the lens of judgement, living becomes serious business! And the effort to live the good life becomes the major objective of any rational person. For hovering over any and everyone who ignores this moral ultimatum of life is the grim warning: 'Be sure your sins will find you out.' With all the good will and generosity in the world, we have found no way to evade or lighten this judgement."

It is really never spelled out just how one determines the will and ways of God, except that Jesus is continuously pointed to as the guide. At one point the author says we must all strive to live a life exactly like Jesus.

IV. COMPARISON TABLE

Table 4

Comparison Table

<u>Based on Form</u>	<u>New Theology</u>	<u>Humanism</u>	<u>Orthodox Christianity</u>
1. The use of the question.	8	none	1
2. The implication of agreement from the reader.	9	none	none
3. The use of humor.	6	none	none
4. The use of the either/or statement.	none	none	5
5. The use of abstract language.	4	6	14
6. The use of concrete language.	17	19	19
7. A strong dramatic quality.	3	5	6

Table 4 (continued)

<u>Based on Content</u>	<u>New Theology</u>	<u>Humanism</u>	<u>Orthodox Christianity</u>
8. The devaluation of religion.	5	6	none
9. A here-and-now orientation vs. an invisible after-world.	none	7	none
10. An emphasis on the invisible after world.	none	none	5
11. A God-less orientation.	13	4	none
12. A God-centered orien- tation.	none	none	21
13. An emphasis on the dignity of man.	2	13	none
14. The emphasis on love as supreme value.	8	none	3
15. An existential orien- tation.	8	6	none
16. Judgemental vs. descriptive.	4	6	7
17. Interpersonal emphases.	9	11	1
18. An appreciation for nature.	1	4	none
19. An emphasis on the helpless- ness of man.	none	none	9
20. Words which are unique to a thought system.	none	none	25

CHAPTER III

COMPARISONS

I. DIFFERENCES BASED ON FORM

The purpose of this chapter is to examine some of the differences between the three schools of thought under consideration. These differences are seen in the comparison table in the last chapter. There will be no effort to deal with differences where they are negligible. Only those categories which have major differences will be considered. The effort will be not simply to point out these differences, but to enunciate what they mean.

In understanding the important, underlying differences between the new theology, humanism, and orthodox Christianity, indicators based on form are of least significance. These tell us something about literary style, about the way the author handles his audience, but they do not reveal much, if anything, about philosophical differences. For these we must turn to differences based on content.

However, we must not bypass the differences based on form altogether. These may give us insights into why an author won or lost his audience, and they do, as already indicated, tell us something of rhetorical style.

To begin with, note the first three indicators in the comparison table. Eight times the new theology literature puts a question in such a way as to imply an answer. Nine times it uses statements which imply

that the reader is in agreement. Six times it uses humor which is biting, sarcastic, and satirical. What does this mean? It means that the author presses very hard for agreement, that this literature is highly evangelistic, more so than is true of either humanism or orthodox Christianity. With one minor exception, the literature of these two schools uses none of these devices.

The use of the question, in this particular manner, attempts to do the reader's thinking for him. The frequent implication of agreement from the reader takes liberties with the thought processes of the reader. The haunting question is, were the readers "with" Bishop Robinson as much as he assumed? And the answer is, probably not. In light of the demise of the influence of the new theology, it is probable that it never took root in the minds of a great many people. For the most part, it was of passing interest.

In contrast to this evangelistic spirit and zeal, humanism and orthodox Christianity seem more content simply to tell their story. They do not use these indicators to press the reader into agreement. There is one exception to this probability, and it concerns indicator four in the comparison table. It will be seen there that orthodox Christianity uses the either/or statement five times, while the new theology and humanism use it not at all. There is some effort revealed here to press the reader into "choosing sides", to "making up his mind one way or another." This, too, can be construed as evangelistic. But it only occurred five times and does not reveal the consistent pattern of this trait as we see it in the new theology.

It is interesting to note that the language of all three schools is concrete rather than abstract. It is easy to read and understand. One need not struggle to find the meaning.

These differences constitute the main ones which are revealed in the differences based on form. We turn now to a consideration of those differences based on content.

II. DIFFERENCES BASED ON CONTENT

The Devaluation of Religion

In both the new theology and humanism, we find a marked devaluation of religion. Neither of these thought systems has any use for an organized religion. In the new theology, it is argued that religion is outmoded, that there is no longer any need for it. Thus Bonhoeffer writes:

The only people left for us to light on in the way of "religion" are a few "last survivals of the age of chivalry," or else one or two who are intellectually dishonest. Would they be the chosen few? Is it on this dubious group and none other that we are to pounce, in fervour, pique, or indignation, in order to sell them the goods we have to offer? Are we to fall upon one or two unhappy people in their weakest moment and force upon them a sort of religious coercion?

The implication in that question is, certainly not! This means there is, then, no need left for religion.

Stating the humanist position very clearly, the Morains write:

Humanism is free from divisive doctrines about the unknown, free from rituals and ceremonies and liturgical regulations which so often separate people and set them apart from each other. There is no damnation, no purgatory, no heaven, no mystical realms or essences. Humanism is concerned with life on this wonderful earth of ours.

Here, too, we see the devaluation of religion, for, as a matter of fact, "rituals and ceremonies and liturgical regulations" are a part of organized religion as we know it. What the humanists do is recast the meaning of religion, and religion on their terms is acceptable.

Consider the Morains when they write:

To us religion is the creation and pursuit of ideals and the relationship men feel with one another and the universe. For us religion and theology are not necessarily the same.

This position of the new theology and humanism in regard to religion poses a major difference in the three schools of thought, for orthodox Christianity appreciates and calls for a continuation of religion.

It is interesting to note that the new theology devaluates religion five times, humanism does six times, and orthodox Christianity never does. Dr. Bosley, in fact, calls dramatically for a "return to religion." He insists that the church, certainly an integral part of organized religion, is of the greatest necessity and that true Christians will find their place in it. There is an appreciation for the ancient creeds of the church and for the rituals and rites of the church. Truly, orthodox Christianity stands squarely behind religion. For those who find organized religion meaningful, and particularly for those who appreciate the church, orthodox Christianity is the only one of these three thought systems with anything to offer. The devaluation of religion could only alienate such people.

We must remember that the new theology represents a movement from within the church, unlike humanism which clearly exists outside of

it. As such, it is small wonder the new theologians were called "heretic" by some people, for they called for the end of the system within which they served. They wrote primarily for people within the church community, and their devaluation of religion no doubt perplexed and irritated some of those people. Most orthodox Christians see humanists as "anti-church" and therefore "anti-Christian." They would no doubt see the new theologians in the same light when they heard the new theologians taking the same position on religion as humanists take. We should note the importance of this. It is on just such an issue as this that some identification between the new theology and humanism might have begun.

The Question of Immortality

The issue of immortality has always been of crucial importance to the church. Dr. Bosley writes that its affirmation is included in every creed of the church. And this brings us to another major difference in the three schools of thought we are considering. We should note, first of all, that the new theology does not deal with this matter in any way, shape, or form. It never once manifested a here-and-now orientation versus an invisible after-world, but neither did it give any emphasis on the invisible after-world. It simply ignored the entire issue. Humanism seven times manifested a here-and-now orientation versus an invisible after-world. Orthodox Christianity never dealt with a here-and-now orientation, but five times it emphasized the invisible after-world. To summarize, the new theology ignores the issue, humanism emphasized the

here-and-now with no thought for an after-world, and orthodox Christianity affirms the reality of the after-world.

It is an assumption of the present author that the new theologians do not believe in immortality. It is incredible to believe they do and ignore it so totally in their writings. Not believing in it, they took the kindest way of getting around the issue which is to ignore it altogether. This, again, aligns them with the humanist position, though that position is not as clear as it might seem. At times, the humanists seem to be denying immortality altogether; at other times, they simply seem to be saying it is not important one way or the other. The Morains write: "In fact, ideas of sin, the ideal, immortality, and deity are considered rather unimportant and are seldom discussed." At any rate, it can be safely said that neither the new theologians or the humanists hold immortality to be very important, if important at all.

This omission by the new theologians is not one orthodox Christians would likely miss. Any book which purports to be on Christian doctrine would be assumed to contain something on this ancient and precious doctrine. Christians look to a life beyond the grave, and there are even vivid descriptions by scholarly writers as to the nature of that life. Dr. Bosley writes:

What a warmly human idea of immortality actually radiates the New Testament! It is a condition or a place in which "God shall wipe away all tears," where the true valuation of life is made clear, where you enter into the place prepared for you, where unswerving loyalty to God will be rewarded by His simple salutation to weary travelers, "Well done, good and faithful servant. Enter thou into thy rest." . . .

When this element of faith is missing altogether, as it is in the rhetoric of the new theologians, it does not go unnoticed. And it is yet another affront to orthodox faith. Orthodox Christians have never been content with the humanist emphasis on the wonder of this life and this earth; they have yet been concerned with the next life and the next earth. In fact, too much of an emphasis on this world has not been considered a good thing, for we must always be preparing ourselves for the still-better world to come.

It would be short-sighted to think this is altogether an academic matter. It touches the emotions as well. Orthodox Christians take belief in immortality seriously. They are bound to be emotionally aroused when it is challenged.

The Question of God

The new theology and humanism do not have a God-centered orientation. Theirs is, in fact, a Godless orientation. Evidence was found thirteen times for a Godless orientation in the new theology and four times in humanism. The latter might have been even higher but the humanists so completely disregard a belief in God that they seldom mention it one way or the other. The Godless quality of new theology rhetoric is found in a statement like this one:

But any notion that God really exists "out there" must be dismissed: "gods are peripheral phenomena produced by evolution." True religion. . .consists in harmonizing oneself with the evolutionary process as it develops ever higher forms of self-consciousness.

Speaking for the humanists, the Morains write, "Theirs is a religion without a God, divine revelation, or sacred scripture."

The orthodox Christian literature revealed, as already stated, a God-centered orientation twenty-one times. This difference between it and the new theology and humanism is somewhat amazing. We must come to the conclusion that this matter represents one of the very most crucial and fundamental differences between orthodox Christianity and the other two schools of thought. Dr. Bosley writes, "There need be no hesitation in affirming that belief in God is the basic belief of the Christian faith." The words "basic belief" should be carefully noted. This means that both the new theology and humanism constitute a challenge and threat to the "basic belief" of orthodox Christianity.

It should be pointed out that the new theologians make some references to the concept of "god" but never to the concept of "a God." That is, they never use the concept of God as a being who thinks, feels, moves and acts. They can only label as God "ultimate reality" or "the ground of our being." This would be no more acceptable to orthodox Christians than if God were destroyed altogether. The God of the new theologians doesn't do anything, and this would be heresy to orthodox Christians. The latter would probably not be so upset over the humanist position; they are familiar with it and it comes as no surprise. But to find within Christianity itself a movement which does not believe in a God is another matter. This defies every creed in existence.

If God is not a being then a relationship to Him seems all but impossible. And Christians seek such a relationship. Dr. Bosley writes:

To say that we believe in God, then, is to say that we believe it is possible for us to find the purpose of our life in His Purpose for life, to find the strength for fulfilling that purpose in His

strong Presence within us yet always beyond us. To believe in God is to seek to lose our life in His that we may find it again--redeemed, renewed, and made radiant with His love.

There is nothing whatsoever like this in either the new theology or the humanist rhetoric. The new theologians deny a theist position as much as they do the position of deism. Bonhoeffer is the only one of these theologians who speaks of God as if he might be a being but he calls this God "powerless" and "suffering." Man must not look to this God for any help. And that is really the upshot of both new theology and humanist rhetoric: There is no God who does anything. This position would be totally unacceptable to orthodox Christians.

An Emphasis on the Dignity of Man

In the orthodox Christian literature, there was no emphasis on the dignity of man, and this is even further proof that the doctrine of God towers above any man-centered doctrine. The new theology literature revealed such an emphasis only two times, but the humanist rhetoric had thirteen references to an emphasis on the dignity of man. It can honestly be said without exaggeration that man is God in humanist thinking. The Morains write, "The supreme value is the individual human being."

The new theology implies this position more than it states it. If God is not a being who does something then man is on his own and must do "it" for himself. If God is "powerless," man must be powerful. If God is "suffering" and weak, man must be well and strong. The position of the new theologians calls for a self-affirmation, though nothing in the rhetoric states the case just that way. There is very little said

about the nature of man. It is said that those who go on believing in a God will do so for "vested interests" or because they are "lazy" or because they are refugees with "unhappy and ignorant souls." This approach, too, suggests something about the nature of man that is not stated directly. His dignity will be intact only if he ceases to believe in a God!

This position, and that of humanism, constitute a direct attack on orthodox Christian theology. It serves as yet one more reason why the encounter between the two alienates orthodox Christianity and perhaps stirs it to anger.

The Emphasis on Love as Supreme Value

It is very interesting that the humanist rhetoric mentions love not at all. Human relationships are mentioned, as we shall see later on, but the character of love is absent altogether. In the orthodox Christian literature, we find three references to the divine nature of love, and these are always attributed directly to the nature of God. It is only in the new theology rhetoric, where we find eight references to love as a supreme value, that love acquires a major emphasis. Thus we find Feuerbach saying, "To believe in God as love means to believe that in pure personal relationship we encounter, not merely what ought to be, but what is, the deepest, veriest truth about the structure of reality." And Robinson writes, ". . .our sense of the sacredness of love derives from the fact that in this relationship as nowhere else there is disclosed and laid bare the divine Ground of all our being."

The new theologians seem to have a greater trust for love than does the rhetoric of orthodox Christianity. For example, the former make love the criteria for morality. If a thing is done in the name of love, it is right; if it violates love, it is wrong. This means that the individual determines morality for himself rather than relying upon commandments or codes. His only guide is love.

This goes much too far for orthodox Christianity. Dr. Bosley says, "The crowning error of moral and ethical relationships is the idea that what I think is right is right for me, and what you think is right is right for you. This is simply not true."

This whole issue comes under the title of what is called "the new morality"; we see it embraced by the new theology and rejected by orthodox Christianity. This is yet another difference between the two schools of thought. The humanist literature takes no direct stand on this issue but leans in the direction of the new morality along with the new theologians. The Morains write:

During the nineteenth century a few thinkers suggested that moral laws have not come to us through revelation. Herbert Spencer's strong voice announced that these are the results of men's experiences in living with one another and are not the precepts of any supreme being. Here we find emphasis on the evolutionary aspects of morality. This too contributes to our philosophy.

Both the new theology and the orthodox Christian rhetorics embrace the Biblical notion that "God is love." However, they do not develop the theme in the same way. In orthodox Christian literature, love is more an adjective for God. God is still very much a being. That is, he is not simply or only love. As a being, he has a life very much his own and this life is characterized by love.

The new theologians are more prone to mean that God is love. . . and that is all. But they are contradictory about this issue. They refuse to turn the adage around and say, Love is God, though they never fully explain why. They also use other words for God such as "Ultimate Reality" and "depth." This is simply a contradiction which cannot be unraveled with available new theology literature. It should not, however, lessen the effort of the new theologians to equate God with love, and it should not detract from the fact that their position on this issue is stronger than that found in the orthodox Christian rhetoric.

An Existential Orientation

Because the term "existential" has so many various and sometimes contradictory meanings, it is important to note again at this point the definition provided in chapter one; "man is viewed as the creator of his own meaning." This viewpoint is expressed eight times in the new theology rhetoric, six times in humanism and not at all in orthodox Christianity.

In orthodox Christianity, man gains his meaning from God, for God is the source of all meaning. Thus Dr. Bosley writes:

God is this deep and abiding meaningfulness of life; God is this essential togetherness of values; God is this unalterable definiteness in life in terms of which life finds purpose and meaning. . . . To say that we believe in God, then, is to say that we believe it is possible for us to find the purpose of our life in His Purpose for life, to find the strength for fulfilling that purpose in His strong Presence within us yet always beyond us. To believe in God is to seek to lose our life in His that we may find it again--redeemed, renewed, and made radiant with his love.

Obviously, since neither believe in God as a being, the new theologians and the humanists do not look in that direction for meaning.

The Morains, quoting Erich Fromm, state that "we are to look for strength not outside ourselves but within." They go on to say, this time quoting Alfred Smith, that there is "no meaning to life except the meaning which man himself gives to life."

It is fairly obvious that the new theologians share this view, for there is, to their way of thinking, no God "out there" to help man. In fact, Bonhoeffer makes the startling suggestion that it is God who needs man! As previously stated, he calls God "powerless" and "suffering" and this weak, impotent God requires that man stand on his own two feet. Bonhoeffer even says that this God wants to be edged out of the world altogether. In the new theology, there is nothing left to give us any meaning except ourselves! As Bonhoeffer put it, "God is teaching us that we must live as men who can get along very well without him." It stands to reason, then, that we can look for meaning only from ourselves, from the meaning we create for ourselves.

In orthodox Christianity, men who make such assumptions are viewed as proud, stubborn, egotists, and even as anti-God. Man simply cannot separate himself this way from God. God is the dispenser of all good things and that includes a meaningful life. It is by placing oneself within God's life that one comes to have a meaningful life.

This difference is a sharp one. It is hard to see how these conflicting views could ever be reconciled. We must be touching again an aspect of thought that alienated the theologians from orthodox Christianity and made its kinship to humanism all the stronger.

Interpersonal Emphases

Interpersonal emphases stress the importance of man's relationships to one another. There was only one instance of this in orthodox Christianity, the greater emphasis being on man's relationship to God. In the new theology rhetoric, such an emphasis occurred nine times and in humanism it occurred eleven times. An example of the new theology emphasis in this regard comes to us through these words of Bishop Robinson: ". . .to say that 'God is personal' is to say that reality is of ultimate significance in the constitution of the universe, that in personal relationships we touch the final meaning of existence as nowhere else." And this theme is reiterated time and time again; it is in the context of relationships that we find our deepest meaning. We should note again, as a contrast to orthodox Christianity, that it is not in our relationship to God. Humanism comes close to the same viewpoint. The Morains write, "To us religion is the creation and pursuit of ideals and the relationship men feel with one another. . . .Brotherhood and mutual aid are chosen as a . . .central idea."

In orthodox Christianity, men are united by their mutual need for God more than by their need for each other. When they serve each other they do so in God's name. It might be important to remind ourselves at this point that love as a value was only mentioned three times in the orthodox rhetoric. But it should not be inferred by any means that this is a "cold, impersonal" system of thought. We come back again and again to the centrality of the doctrine of God who is the source of love. The emphasis is always on God, for he is the source of all good

things. If men love one another it will be because they first love God. Therefore, the emphasis is never on the human encounters of this life except indirectly. The human encounters are made good because men first love and find God.

In the new theology and in humanism there is nothing comparable to this emphasis. Men do not first seek God because there is no God to seek. Therefore, it stands to reason that they first seek each other! And in that context they find their meaning. It should fairly be pointed out that humanism, for all its emphasis on interpersonal relationship, has also emphasis on what can only be called rugged individualism. The nurturing of the individual is singular in importance. This importance outranks the interpersonal emphasis. Men should be in encounters because that is the way the individual becomes even more noble. Interpersonal relationships are, therefore, a means to an even greater end. This way of thinking, incidentally, is not characteristic of the new theology.

The issue really comes down to whether life should be man-centered or God-centered. It can scarcely come as any surprise that orthodox Christianity takes a God-centered view and the other two schools are man-centered. It is only logical that the latter two would therefore have the greater interpersonal emphasis.

An Emphasis on the Helplessness of Man

The helplessness of man means that man is dependent upon God for the fulfillment of his needs. It is quite unlikely that we would find such a viewpoint in either new theology or humanist rhetoric, and, indeed,

we do not. However, it comes up nine times in the orthodox Christian rhetoric and that is only logical. In light of everything that has already been said about the orthodox position on God, it would be very strange if man did not need him. And need does imply a kind of helplessness.

Humanists see no reason whatsoever why man needs God. Man, claim the humanists, is better off without one. Man is his own creator, his own builder. And he has the capacity to help himself. The Morains write:

The humanist is filled with wonder and admiration at the creature that is man, at his capacity for accomplishment, for sacrifice, at the intricacy and precision of that nervous system which has made it possible for him to stand where he does today in nature's hierarchy. He is convinced that if we use to an ever greater extent our unique capacities for discovery and for cooperation that future of our race will be a brilliant and a happy one.

It will also be a God-less one, for never does the humanist look to a God for anything. The new theologians share this view.

But certainly this is not so with orthodox Christianity. Dr. Bosley writes, "Jesus Christ is God's supreme effort to waken us to our utter and complete dependence upon His will for us and for all mankind." The matter could hardly be put more strongly. We have an "utter and complete dependence" upon God, and this is surely something of a helpless position in which to be.

The new theology certainly sent a challenge into the orthodox community. By destroying a being-God, a God who does something, whence, as the Psalmist put it, "cometh my help?". The answer which the Psalmist gave himself was that "my help cometh from the Lord, who made

heaven and earth." But in the new theology there is no Lord! There is simply no God to help us with anything. Man, as already stated, is decidedly and totally on his own. This is frightening if you consider the long tradition of orthodox Christianity with its timeless emphasis upon "God's help." The believer is promised God will help him through prayer and through other methods. The new theology said just the opposite: no help. That answer could hardly be acceptable to a great many orthodox Christians.

Words Which are Unique to a Thought System

An effort was made to isolate words which are not found elsewhere or which are used in some unique content. It was impossible to isolate any such words in either the new theology or humanism. There were instances of twenty-five such words in orthodox Christianity. These included such words as "salvation," "judgement," "trinity," "gospel," and "grace." Among other things, this probably means that orthodox Christianity is more of a community than either the new theology or humanism. The orthodox Christians share more in common, and among the things they share is a language. This has significance for the Whorf hypothesis mentioned in the introduction. It seems to indicate that orthodox Christianity is, indeed, a linguistic island. It is very important to note that the new theology, a movement within orthodox Christianity, omits all such words. There is no use of them whatsoever. They are not mentioned. The familiarity of the map of orthodox Christians is taken away. The old words are heard no more. We should remember that the new theology did not come along to be a new religion; it came along to reform an old one. Could

it be that it took too much away? And that among the things it took was a vocabulary with which the orthodox Christian feels at home? Imagine omitting the word "immortality." We have already considered the impact of this, and this is but one word among twenty-five examples. Perhaps the new map was so totally strange as to be frightening. The "island" did not feel familiar anymore.

CHAPTER IV

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The purpose of this paper has been to compare linguistic indicators in the new theology, humanism, and orthodox Christianity. This has been done by a language analysis of three books, Honest to God, by Bishop A. T. Robinson (the new theology); Humanism as the Next Step, by Lloyd and Mary Morain (humanism); and A Firm Faith for Today, by Dr. Harold Bosley (orthodox Christianity). An effort has been made to determine the effects of the language of humanism, as expressed in the new theology, on orthodox Christians. In a number of ways, this effect was not a positive one. The demise of the new theology can be credited in some measure to its humanistic language.

The new theology was a theological movement that swept through the churches in the turbulent decade of the 1960's. In its systematic approach to Christian theology, God is no longer a being. There is, in fact, no supreme being. There is, therefore, a strong emphasis on what man must do for himself. The God of the new theologians does not act in any way.

Humanism, a very old philosophical school, is characterized by the profound adage that "man is the measure of all things." It constitutes a philosophical way of thinking far more than it does a religion.

Orthodox Christianity refers to that great body of traditional Christians who participate to some measure in the organized church. A supernatural God is the central belief which characterizes this body of people.

The analysis was made by listing twenty linguistic indicators which were tabulated according to frequency of use in each sample of literature. In presenting a summary here, the indicators based on form are included as they give us insight into the way the author dealt with his audience.

In the new theology literature, the most frequent indicators were:

Based on form

- Use of the question
- The implication of agreement by the reader
- The use of humor
- The use of concrete language

Based on content

- The devaluation of religion
- A rejection of any emphasis on the invisible after-world
- A God-less orientation
- The emphasis on love as supreme value

In humanism, the main indicators used were:

Based on form

- The use of concrete language

Based on content

- A here-and-now orientation vs. an invisible after-world
- An existential orientation
- A God-less orientation
- An emphasis on the dignity of man

Interpersonal emphases

An appreciation for nature

In orthodox Christianity, the main factors used were:

Based on form

A strong dramatic quality

Use of the either/or statement

Based on content

Words which are unique to a thought system

An emphasis on the invisible after-world

Judgemental vs. evaluative

A God-centered orientation

In chapter three an effort was made to compare these three schools of thought to one another. It was discovered that the new theology and humanism were alike on thirteen out of twenty of the comparison factors and that these two schools of thought were together with each other but differed from orthodox Christianity on ten of these thirteen factors.

Based on the comparative analysis, it is fair to say that the new theology is, in fact, humanistic in tone and spirit. One gets the distinct impression that these two ways of thinking are headed in the same direction. Man's action, in both schools, are of ultimate importance. Neither is there, in either school, a supreme being, nor is there any importance attached to a future life beyond this world. In short, on all major issues, with one exception, these two postures are nearly the same.

This exception probably makes it impossible to label the new theology as outright humanism. The exception centers on the issue of God. As previously stated, in the new theology, as in humanism, there is no supreme being. Neither is there, in the new theology, any God who seems to do anything. But there is still something which the new theologians want to label God, and this prevents us from saying the new theology and humanism are identical. This God of the new theologians is called "depth," "Ultimate Reality," and "the ground of our being." These definitions seem to center around some aspect of the human experience. This God is not an independent being who acts in the world in any way. Bonhoeffer, the only one of the theologians who seems to lean at all in the direction of a "being God," calls God "powerless" and "suffering." He makes it clear God is calling man to stand on his own two feet and act for himself.

The upshot of this is that we do not, in fact, have much more of a God than we do in humanism. But since the new theologians retain the use of the word God, the system cannot be identified with outright, total humanism.

It is doubtful, however, if orthodox Christians make this fine distinction. From their viewpoint, the new theology may have seemed to be outright humanism. Nowhere in the body of the new theology literature do we find a God who helps man. And this characteristic is paramount to any understanding of the doctrine of God in orthodox thought. God is at the very center of orthodox theology, and this God acts, moves, and does things. He answers prayer. He helps man find meaning for life. He helps

man overcome his trials and tribulations. In the orthodox way of looking upon God, man is very much dependent. In fact, the implication is that, without God, man can do nothing.

In the beginning of this study, it was stated that the doctrine of man would be stressed since it was felt that the conflict over this issue was central to understanding the clash between the new theology and orthodox Christianity. An analysis of the literature reveals that the doctrine of God is as central to that clash as is the doctrine of man. We cannot possibly understand the differences between the new theology and orthodox Christianity without coming to grips with such doctrine.

As to the doctrine of man, the differences are more implied than stated. The new theologians do not really develop an outright doctrine of man. But the meaning of man is clear when one analyzes the meaning of God. Man must be independent and act on his own behalf. He must not look to any God for any kind of help. This says something about the stature of man which would probably be rejected in orthodox Christian rhetoric. There is no implication in the new theology that man is a sinner or that he faces a judgement. In ethics, he is on his own, determining right and wrong for himself with love as the basis. He does not go to church to find or learn about God but to find more fruitful ways of living in and serving the world.

It seems possible to draw the following conclusions which center around the issues with which we have just dealt:

1. The new theology is humanistic in tone and spirit.
2. The new theology cannot be called outright humanism since it does have a doctrine of God.

3. The doctrine of God which we find in the new theology is totally unacceptable to orthodox Christianity and might very well seem humanistic from that perspective.
4. The doctrine of man would, in fact, be a paramount difference between the new theology and orthodox Christianity, though this doctrine emerges more by implication in the new theology than by outright definition.
5. In the comparison study made earlier in this paper, the new theology and humanism coincided thirteen out of twenty times and jointly diverged from orthodox Christianity ten times. This means that the new theology is closely identified with humanism but is significantly different from orthodox Christianity.

Suggestions for Further Research

It is believed that further research would be helpful if it included surveys and questionnaires among church members to determine more directly their attitudes toward the new theology. It would be interesting, for example, to see how many of them know anything about it after this amount of time. Those who were exposed to it, and have some understanding of it, would surely remember enough to convey their attitudes about it. Such questions as these might be helpful: Do you agree or disagree with the new theology? Do you feel you understand it? Do you feel it should have more or less influence in the church? Another possibility would be to use a questionnaire on general items of religious faith to see how the answers compare with the positions of the new theology.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Bosley, Harold. A Firm Faith for Today. New York: Harper and Row, 1950.
2. Carney, Thomas. Content Analysis. London: B. T. Batsford Ltd., 1972.
3. DeCecco, John. The Psychology of Language, Thought and Instruction. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1967.
4. De Sola Pool, Ithiel. Trends in Content Analysis. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1959.
5. Geyer, Alan and Dean Peerman. Theological Crossings. Grand Rapids, Michigan: William Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1971.
6. Hastings, A. W. Theologians of Our Time. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1966.
7. Hughes, Phillip. Creative Minds in Contemporary Theology. Grand Rapids, Michigan: William Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1969.
8. Marty, Martin and Dean Peerman. The New Theology, Vol. 1. New York: MacMillan, 1964.
9. Marty, Martin and Dean Peerman. The New Theology, Vol. 2. New York: MacMillan, 1965.
10. Marty, Martin and Dean Peerman. The New Theology, Vol. 3. New York: MacMillan, 1966.
11. Marty, Martin and Dean Peerman. The New Theology, Vol. 4. New York: MacMillan, 1967.
12. Marty, Martin and Dean Peerman. The New Theology, Vol. 8. New York: MacMillan, 1971.
13. Meynell, Hugo. The New Theology and Modern Theologians. London: Melbourne, Sheed and Ward, 1967.
14. Morain, Lloyd and Mary Morain. Humanism as the Next Step. Boston: Beacon Press, 1954.

15. Robinson, John. Honest to God. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1954.
16. Walker, John Baptist. Christianity, An End to Magic. London: Darton, Longman and Todd, 1972.
17. Werkmeister, W. H. Man and His Values. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1967.
18. Whale, J. S. Christian Doctrine. Cambridge: The University Press, 1963.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

Excerpts from Honest to God by Bishop A. T. Robinson

Excerpts from Honest to God by Bishop A. T. Robinson

1. But suppose such a super-Being "out there" is really only a sophisticated version of the Old Man in the sky? Suppose belief in God does not, indeed cannot, mean being persuaded of the "existence" of some entity, even a supreme entity, which might or might not be there, like life on Mars? Suppose the atheists are right--but that this is no more the end or denial of Christianity than the discrediting of the God "up there," which must in its time have seemed the contradiction of all that the Bible said? Suppose that all such atheism does is to destroy an idol, and that we can and must get on without a God "out there" at all? Have we seriously faced the possibility that to abandon such an idol may in the future be the only way of making Christianity meaningful, except to the few remaining equivalents of flat-earthers (just as to have clung earlier to the God "up there" would have made it impossible in the modern world for any but primitive peoples to believe the Gospel)? Perhaps after all the Freudians are right, that such a God--the God of traditional popular theology--is a projection, and perhaps we are being called to live without that projection in any form.

2. That is not an attractive proposition: inevitably it feels like being orphaned. And it is bound to be misunderstood and resisted as a denial of the Gospel, as a betrayal of what the Bible says (though actually the Bible speaks in literal terms of a God whom we have already abandoned). And it will encounter the opposition not only of the fundamentalists but of 90 per cent of Church people. Equally it will be resented by most unthinking non-churchgoers, who tend to be more jealous of the beliefs they have rejected and deeply shocked that they should be betrayed. Above all, there is the large percentage of oneself that finds this revolution unacceptable and wishes it were unnecessary.

3. God, Tillich was saying, is not a projection "out there," another being beyond the skies, of whose existence we have to convince ourselves, but the Ground of our very being.

The name of this infinite and inexhaustible depth and ground of all being is God. That depth is what the word God means. And if that word has not much meaning for you, translate it, and speak of the depths of your life, of the source of your being, of your ultimate concern, of what you take seriously without any reservation. Perhaps, in order to do so, you must forget everything traditional that you have learned about God, perhaps even that word itself. For if you know that God means depth, you know much about him. You cannot then call yourself an atheist or unbeliever. For you cannot think or say: Life has no depth! Life is shallow. Being itself is surface only. If you could say this in com-

plete seriousness, you would be an atheist; but otherwise you are not. He who knows about depth knows about God.

--Tillich

4. Hitherto, Bonhoeffer was saying, the Church has based its preaching of the Gospel on the appeal to religious experience, to the fact that deep down every man feels the need for religion in some form, the need for a God to whom to give himself, a God in terms of whom to explain the world. But suppose men come to feel that they can get along perfectly well without "religion," without any desire for personal salvation, without any sense of sin, without any need of "that hypothesis"? Is Christianity to be confined to those who still have this sense of insufficiency, this "God-shaped blank," or who can be induced to have it? Bonhoeffer's answer was to say that God is deliberately calling us in this twentieth century to a form of Christianity that does not depend on the premise of religion, just as St. Paul was calling men in the first century to a form of Christianity that did not depend on the premise of circumcision.

5. Traditional Christian theology has been based upon the proofs for the existence of God. The presupposition of these proofs, psychologically if not logically, is that God might or might not exist. They argue from something which everyone admits exists (the world) to a Being beyond it who could or could not be there. The purpose of the argument is to show that he must be there, that his being is "necessary"; but the presupposition behind it is that there is an entity or being "out there" whose existence is problematic and has to be demonstrated. Now such an entity, even if it could be proved beyond dispute, would not be God; it would merely be a further piece of existence, that might conceivably not have been there--or a demonstration would not have been required.

6. Rather, we must start the other way round. God is, by definition, ultimate reality. And one cannot argue whether ultimate reality exists. One can only ask what ultimate reality is like--whether, for instance, in the last analysis what lies at the heart of things and governs their working is to be described in personal or impersonal categories. Thus, the fundamental theological question consists not in establishing the "existence" of God as a separate entity but in pressing through in ultimate concern to what Tillich calls "the ground of our being."

7. The traditional formulation of Christianity, Tillich says, has been in terms of what he calls "supranaturalism." According to this way of thinking, which is what we have all been brought up to, God is posited as "the highest Being"--out there, above and beyond this world, existing in his own right alongside and over against his creation. As Tillich puts it elsewhere, he is

. . .a being beside others and as such part of the whole of reality. He certainly is considered its most important

part, but as a part and therefore as subjected to the structure of the whole. . . .He is seen as a self which has a world, as an ego which is related to a thou, as a cause which is separated from its effect, as having a definite space and an endless time. He is a being, not being-itself.

The caricature of this way of thinking is the Deist conception of God's relation to the world. Here God is the supreme Being, the grand Architect, who exists somewhere out beyond the world--like a rich aunt in Australia--who started it all going, periodically intervenes in its running, and generally gives evidence of his benevolent interest in it.

It is a simple matter to shoot down this caricature and to say that what we believe in is not Deism but Theism, and that God's relationship to the world is fully and intimately personal, not this remote watch-maker relationship described by the Deists. But it is easy to modify the quality of the relationship and to leave the basic structure of it unchanged, so that we continue to picture God as a Person, who looks down at this world which he has made and loves from "out there." We know, of course, that he does not exist in space. But we think of him nevertheless as defined and marked off from other beings as if he did. And this is what is decisive. He is thought of as a Being whose separate existence over and above the sum of things has to be demonstrated and established.

8. It is difficult to criticize this way of thinking without appearing to threaten the entire fabric of Christianity--so interwoven is it in the warp and woof of our thinking. And, of course, it is criticized by those who reject this supranaturalist position as a rejection of Christianity. Those who, in the famous words of Laplace to Napoleon, "find no need of this hypothesis" attack it in the name of what they call the "naturalist" position. The most influential exponent of this position in England today, Professor Julian Huxley, expressly contrasts "dualistic supernaturalism" with "unitary naturalism." The existence of God as a separate entity can, he says, be dismissed as superfluous; for the world may be explained just as adequately without positing such a Being.

The "naturalist" view of the world identifies God, not indeed with the totality of things, the universe, per se, but with what gives meaning and direction to nature. In Tillich's words,

The phrase deus sive natura, used by people like Scotus Erigena and Spinoza, does not say that God is identical with nature but that he is identical with natura naturans, the creative nature, the creative ground of all natural objects. In modern naturalism the religious quality of these affirmations has almost disappeared, especially among philosophising scientists who understand nature in terms of materialism and mechanism.

Huxley himself has indeed argued movingly for religion as a necessity of the human spirit. But any notion that God really exists "out there" must be dismissed: "gods are peripheral phenomena produced by evolution." True religion (if that is not a contradiction in terms, as it would be for the Marxist) consists in harmonizing oneself with the evolutionary process as it develops ever higher forms of self-consciousness.

9. Bultmann says boldly, "There is nothing specifically Christian in the mythical view of the world as such. It is simply the cosmology of a pre-scientific age." The New Testament, he says, presents redemption in Christ as a supranatural event--as the incarnation from "the other side" of a celestial Being who enters this earthly scene through a miraculous birth, performs signs and wonders as an indication of his heavenly origin, and after an equally miraculous resurrection returns by ascent to the celestial sphere whence he came. In truth, Bultmann maintains, all this language is not, properly speaking, describing a supranatural transaction of any kind but is an attempt to express the real depth, dimension and significance of the historical event of Jesus Christ. In this person and event there was something of ultimate, unconditional significance for human life--and that, translated into the mythological view of the world, comes out as "God" (a Being up there) "sending" (to "this" world) his only-begotten "Son." The transcendental significance of the historical event is "objectivized" as a supranatural transaction.

10. Bonhoeffer speaks of the God of "religion" as a deus ex machina. He must be "there" to provide the answers and explanations beyond the point at which our understanding or our capacities fail. But such a God is constantly pushed further and further back as the tide of secular studies advances. In science, in politics, in ethics the need is no longer felt for such a stop-gap or long-step; he is not required in order to guarantee anything, to solve anything, or in any way to come to the rescue. In the same vein Julian Huxley writes:

The God hypothesis is no longer of any pragmatic value for the interpretation or comprehension of nature, and indeed often stands in the way of better and truer interpretation. Operationally, God is beginning to resemble not a ruler but the last fading smile of a cosmic Cheshire Cat. It will soon be as impossible for an intelligent, educated man or woman to believe in a god as it is now to believe that the earth is flat, that flies can be spontaneously generated, that disease is a divine punishment, or that death is always due to witchcraft. Gods will doubtless survive, sometimes under the protection of vested interests, or in the shelter of lazy minds, or as puppets used by politicians, or as refuges for unhappy and ignorant souls.

And it is in this final haunt, says Bonhoeffer, that the God who has been elbowed out of every other sphere has a "last secret place," in the private world of the individual's need. This is the sphere of "religion" and it is here that the Churches now operate, doing their work among those who feel, or can be induced to feel this need.

The only people left for us to light on in the way of "religion" are a few "last survivals of the age of chivalry," or else one or two who are intellectually dishonest. Would they be the chosen few? Is it on this dubious group and none other that we are to pounce, in fervour, pique, or indignation, in order to sell them the goods we have to offer? Are we to fall upon one or two unhappy people in their weakest moment and force upon them a sort of religious coercion?

11. Bonhoeffer's answer is that we should boldly discard "the religious premise," as St. Paul had the courage to jettison circumcision as a precondition of the Gospel, and accept "the world's coming of age" as a God-given fact. "The only way to be honest is to recognize that we have to live in the world etsi deus non daretur--even if God is not "there." Like children outgrowing the secure religious, moral and intellectual framework of the home, in which "Daddy" is always there in the background, "God is teaching us that we must live as men who can get along very well without him."

The God who makes us live in this world without using him as a working hypothesis is the God before whom we are ever standing. Before God and with him we live without God. God allows himself to be edged out of the world, and that is exactly the way, the only way, in which he can be with us and help us. . . . This is the decisive difference between Christianity and all religions. Man's religiosity makes him look in his distress to the power of God in the world; he uses God as a Deus ex machina. The Bible however directs him to the powerlessness and suffering of God; only a suffering God can help. To this extent we may say that the process we have described by which the world came of age was an abandonment of a false conception of God, and a clearing of the decks for the God of the Bible, who conquers power and space in the world by his weakness. This must be the starting point for our "worldly" interpretation.

--Bonhoeffer

12. It is not merely that the Old Man in the Sky is only a mythological symbol for the Infinite Mind behind the scenes, nor yet that this Being is benevolent rather than fearful: The

truth is that this whole way of thinking is wrong, and if such a Being did exist, he would be the very devil.

--John Wren-Lewis

13. The translation from the God "up there" to the God "out there," though of liberating psychological significance, represented, as I have said, no more than a change of direction in spatial symbolism. Both conceptions presuppose fundamentally the same relationship between "God" on the one hand and "the world" on the other: God is a Being existing in his own right to whom the world is related in the sort of way the earth is to the sun. Whether the sun is "above" a flat earth or "beyond" a round one does not fundamentally affect the picture. But suppose there is no Being out there at all? Suppose, to use our analogy, the skies are empty?

14. The name of this infinite and inexhaustible ground of history is God. That is what the word means, and it is that to which the words Kingdom of God and Divine Providence point. And if these words do not have much meaning for you, translate them, and speak of the depth of history, of the ground and aim of our social life, and of what you take seriously without reservation in your moral and political activities. Perhaps you should call this depth hope, simply hope. For if you find hope in the ground of history, you are united with the great prophets who were able to look into the depth of their times, who tried to escape it, because they could not stand the horror of their visions, and who yet had the strength to look to an even deeper level and there to discover hope.

--Paul Tillich

15. . . .to say that "God is personal" is to say that reality at its very deepest level is personal, that personality is of ultimate significance in the constitution of the universe, that in personal relationships we touch the final meaning of existence as nowhere else. "To predicate personality of God," says Feuerbach, "is nothing else than to declare personality as the absolute essence." To believe in God as love means to believe that in pure personal relationships we encounter, not merely what ought to be, but what is, the deepest, veriest truth about the structure of reality. This, in face of all the evidence, is a tremendous act of faith. But it is not the feat of persuading oneself of the existence of a super-Being beyond this world endowed with personal qualities. Belief in God is the trust, the well-nigh incredible trust, that to give ourselves to the uttermost in love is not to be confounded but to be "accepted," that Love is the ground of our being, to which ultimately we "come home."

16. "The true atheist," Feuerbach wrote, "is not the man who denies God, the subject; it is the man for whom the attributes of divinity, such as love, wisdom and justice, are nothing. And denial of the subject is by no means necessarily denial of the attributes."

17. Statements about God are acknowledgments of the transcendent, unconditional element in all our relationships, and supremely in our relationships with other persons. Theological statements are indeed affirmations about the ultimate ground and depth of that existence.

18. . . .our sense of the sacredness of love derives from the fact that in this relationship as nowhere else there is disclosed and laid bare the divine Ground of all our being.

19. The necessity for the name "God" lies in the fact that our being has depths which naturalism, whether evolutionary, mechanistic, dialectical or humanistic, cannot or will not recognize.

20. The man who acknowledges the transcendence of God is the man who in the conditioned relationships of life recognizes the unconditional and responds to it in unconditional personal relationship. In Tillich's words again,

To call God transcendent in this sense does not mean that one must establish a "superworld" of divine objects. It does mean that, within itself, the finite world points beyond itself. In other words, it is self-transcendent.

21. But for the Bible "the deep things of God" cannot be plumbed, the transcendence of God cannot be understood, simply by searching the depths of the individual soul. God, since he is Love, is encountered in his fullness only "between man and man."

22. Whether one has "known" God is tested by one question only, "How deeply have you loved?"--for "He who does not love does not know God; for God is love."

Now this links up with what Bonhoeffer was saying about a "non-religious" understanding of God. For this ultimate and most searching question has nothing to do with "religion." It rests our eternal salvation upon nothing peculiarly religious. Encounter with the Son of Man is spelt out in terms of an entirely "secular" concern for food, water

supplies, housing, hospitals and prisons, just as Jeremiah had earlier defined the knowledge of God in terms of doing justice for the poor and needy. Indeed, in Macmurray's words, "the great contribution of the Hebrew to religion was that he did away with it." A right relationship to God depended on nothing religious; in fact religion could be the greatest barrier to it.

23. But we must be able to read the nativity story without assuming that its truth depends on there being a literal interruption of the natural by the supernatural, that Jesus can only be Emmanuel--God with us--if, as it were, he came through from another world. For, as supernaturalism becomes less and less credible, to tie the action of God to such a way of thinking is to banish it for increasing numbers into the preserve of the pagan myths and thereby to sever it from any real connection with history. As Christmas becomes a pretty story, naturalism--the attempt to explain Christ, like everything else, on humanistic pre-suppositions--is left in possession of the field as the only alternative with any claim to the allegiance of intelligent men.

24. And thus it comes about that it is only on the Cross that Jesus can be the bearer of the final revelation and the embodiment of God's decisive act; it is "Christ crucified" who is "the power of God and the wisdom of God." For it is in this ultimate surrender of self, in love "to the uttermost," that Jesus is so completely united to the Ground of his being that he can say, "I and the Father are one. . . The Father is in me and I am in the father."

It is in Jesus, and Jesus alone, that there is nothing of self to be seen, but solely the ultimate, unconditional love of God. It is as he emptied himself utterly of himself that he became the carrier of "the name which is above every name. . ."

25. For it is in making himself nothing, in his utter self-surrender to others in love, that Jesus discloses and lays bare the Ground of man's being as love.

26. God allows himself to be edged out of the world and on to the cross. God is weak and powerless in the world, and that is exactly the way, the only way, in which he can be with us and help us. Matthew 8.17 makes it crystal clear that it is not by his omnipotence that Christ helps us, but by his weakness and suffering. . . . Man's religiosity makes him look in his distress to the power of God in the world; he uses God as a Deus ex machina. The Bible, however, directs him to the powerlessness and suffering of God; only a suffering God can help.

27. Faith is participation in this Being of Jesus (incarnation, cross and resurrection). Our relation to God is not a religious relationship to a supreme Being, absolute in power and goodness, which is a spurious conception of transcendence, but a new life for others, through participation in the Being of God. The transcendence consists not in tasks beyond our scope and power, but in the nearest Thou at hand. God in human form, not, as in other religions, in animal form--the monstrous, chaotic, remote and terrifying--nor yet in abstract form--the absolute, metaphysical, infinite, etc.--nor yet in the Greek divine-human of autonomous man, but man existing for others, and hence the Crucified. A life based on the transcendent.

28. Jesus is "the man for others," the one in whom Love has completely taken over, the one who is utterly open to, and united with, the Ground of his being. And this "life for others, through participation in the Being of God," is transcendence.

29. Holy Communion is communion, community-life, in sacris, in depth, at the level at which we are not merely in human fellowship but "in Christ," not merely in love but in Love, united with the ground and restorer of our whole being.

30. The purpose of worship is not to retire from the secular into the department of the religious, let alone to escape from "this world" into "the other world," but to open oneself to the meeting of the Christ in the common, to that which has the power to penetrate its superficiality and redeem it from its alienation. The function of worship is to make us more sensitive to these depths; to focus, sharpen and deepen our response to the world and to other people beyond the point of proximate concern (of liking, self-interest, limited commitment, etc.) to that of ultimate concern; to purify and correct our lives in the light of Christ's love; and in him to find the grace and power to be the reconciled and reconciling community.

31. I wonder whether Christian prayer, prayer in the light of the Incarnation, is not to be defined in terms of penetration through the world to God. For the moment of revelation is precisely so often, in my experience, the moment of meeting and unconditional engagement. How easily one finds oneself giving pious advice to a person faced with a decision to "go away and pray about it." But, if I am honest, what enlightenment I have had on decisions has almost always come not when I have gone away and stood back from them, but precisely as I have wrestled through all the most practical pros and cons, usually with other people. And this activity, undertaken by a Christian trusting and expecting that God is there, would seem to be prayer.

32. Love alone, because, as it were, it has a built-in moral compass, enabling it to "home" intuitively upon the deepest need of the other, can allow itself to be directed completely by the situation. . . .It is able to embrace an ethic of radical responsiveness, meeting every situation on its own merits, with no prescriptive laws.

APPENDIX B

Excerpts from Humanism as the Next Step, by the Morains

Excerpts from Humanism as the Next Step, by the Morains

1. Down through the ages men have been seeking a universal religion or way of life. They are still seeking. Throughout the world there are wide cultural variations. Ways of worship, rituals, symbols, and sacraments are different. Humanism, built squarely on the universal idea of brotherhood, upon the golden rule, shows promise of becoming a great world faith.
2. Humanists are content with fixing their attention on this life and on this earth. Theirs is a religion without a God, divine revelation, or sacred scriptures. Yet theirs is a faith rich in feeling and understanding. They see sorrows and joys, tragedies and triumphs, touching every fiber of human life. They experience wholesome humility as they venture forward with their fellow men into the as-yet-unknown.
3. Humanism is free from divisive doctrines about the unknown, deity, revelation, sacred scriptures, rituals, sacraments, formal theology, and such befuddling ideas as the radical separation of either the world or the individual into matter and spirit.
4. Humanism is a philosophy of men's relations to one another and to nature, rather than of men's relations to deity.
5. To us religion is the creation and pursuit of ideas and the relationship men feel with one another and with the universe. For us religion and theology are not necessarily the same.
6. Most humanists believe that the ordinary individual can have a religious experience which does not include any supernatural element. Humanists suggest that religious feeling and attitudes have been mistakenly limited. They have been limited to that which is becoming less and less real and meaningful to us--the old theologies and rituals.
7. John Dewey describes religious attitudes as basically a thoroughgoing and deep-seated harmonizing of the self with the universe. And he further defines religious experience as that which has the power to bring about a deeper and more enduring adjustment to life. Can we not agree with Dewey that everyday life will have more meaning once we realize that religious experiences are a part of its fabric?

8. Religion without a supernatural element becomes meaningful and personal.

9. One of the great religious humanist pioneers, John H. Dietrich, pointed out:

For centuries the idea of God has been the very heart of religion; it has been said "no God, no religion." But humanism thinks of religion as something very different and far deeper than any belief in God. To it, religion is not the attempt to establish right relations with a supernatural being, but rather the upreaching and aspiring impulse in a human life. It is life striving for its completest fulfillment, and anything which contributes to this fulfillment is religious, whether it be associated with the idea of God or not.

10. Another humanist pioneer, Charles Francis Potter, defines humanism as, "Faith in the supreme self-perfectibility of the human personal-it."

11. As John Herman Randall, Jr., has said, history is

. . .an alternation of two moods. . .there is the mood of supernaturalism. . .a mood of dependence and self-abnegation, a bitter realization of frustration and failure, in which man's confidence oozes to nothingness and he feels himself the plaything of forces which he cannot pretend to comprehend.

And there is the humanist hope "involving the triumphant apotheosis of man, the creator and builder."

12. If this is the only life we can be sure of, let us make it a worthy one.

13. During the nineteenth century a few thinkers suggested that moral laws have not come to us through revelation. Herbert Spencer's strong voice announced that these are the results of men's experiences in living with one another and are not the precepts of any supreme being. Here we find emphasis on the evolutionary aspect of morality. This too contributes to our philosophy.

14. Whereas in most other religions and in some philosophies certain matters have been laid down, accepted on faith and held to be true for

all time, this is not true in humanism. We hold in high regard the scientific method--the constant search for information and the willingness to change opinions as facts warrant.

15. In fact, ideas of sin, the ideal, immortality, and deity are considered rather unimportant and are seldom discussed.

16. Men, like all other living things, must rely upon themselves, upon one another, and upon nature. There is no evidence that they receive support or guidance from any immaterial power with whom they are presumed to commune.

17. The spiritual meaning of life is that which we give to it. Happiness and self-fulfillment for oneself and others are richly sufficient life goals.

18. The supreme value is the individual human being.

19. Harold R. Rafton, founder and president of the Humanist Fellowship of Boston, when asked, "Do you believe in a supreme being?" replied, "Emphatically yes, and that supreme being is man."

20. Most of them think of Jesus as a great if not the greatest ethical leader who has ever lived. To the work of the previous Jewish prophets he added a special insistence on the place of love, kindness, and forgiveness in human life. Humanists do not attribute divinity to him but find inspiration in his life and teachings. They believe that the way of life taught by Jesus has been obscured by creeds and rituals and that fundamentally his teachings were concerned with human relations and with the daily practice of the social virtues.

21. Humanism is concerned that through intelligent cooperation men live a good life and lessen poverty, war, disease, and prejudice.

22. At this time there just does not seem to be any evidence of, or any need for, an immaterial soul.

23. The Humanist lives as if this world were all and enough. He is not otherworldly. He holds that the time spent on the contemplation of a possible after-life is time wasted. He

fears no hell and seeks no heaven, save that which he and other men create on earth. He willingly accepts the world that exists on this side of the grave as the place for moral struggle and creative living. He seeks the life abundant for his neighbor as for himself. He is content to live one world at a time and let the next life--if such there may be--take care of itself. He need not deny immortality; he simply is not interested. His interests are here.

--Edwin H. Wilson

24. If humanists are without a dependable fatherly being who will protect them against nature, they realize that in another sense nature itself is dependable. As men study their environment, it becomes more and more predictable and less and less frightening. As men understand and cooperate with nature they flourish. Ours is the assurance that no event, no experience, is necessarily mysterious. There is a basic sort of order and explanation, if we could but find it, for all the things that happen to us and around us.

25. Humanism is free from divisive doctrines about the unknown, free from rituals and ceremonies and liturgical regulations which so often separate people and set them apart from each other. There is no damnation, no purgatory, no heaven, no mystical realms or essences. Humanism is concerned with life on this wonderful earth of ours.

26. Humanism teaches first there is an intrinsic, inalienable value in all human beings. This is not a value that has been given us by a deity or that we hold only because we have earned it. It is our birth-right. We can have a mystical and poignant depth of feeling about this. At the very heart of our philosophy is a warmly genuine sense of the value in every man, whatever his ability, however he is circumstanced.

27. We are to look for strength not outside ourselves but within. Erich Fromm, in his book Psychoanalysis and Religion, speaks of the value of having a faith in the power within ourselves to meet life with courage. Some philosophies and religions stress how weak, how evil, and how foolish we are by nature. Although they offer a way of overcoming this lack of strength, virtue, and wisdom, they first impress on us our deficiencies. How much better it is to emphasize hope and self-confidence. How much better to believe that we must and can take care of ourselves.

28. Ethics in the humanism view is largely the responsibility we have for the happiness of others. There are no inflexible rules in personal ethics, for what will be ethical in one situation will not necessarily be so in another.

29. The fourth faith (humanism) also provides us the strongest possible motive for kindness and consideration, for justice and honesty. If we believe there will be no second chance in a future life to make up to family, friends, and acquaintances for the difficulties and unhappiness which we cause them, and if we believe there is no future of bliss for them but that this life we share is all they will ever know, it becomes crucial that we do what we can to make this existence a happy one.

30. When you have arrived at the humanist perspective of life, fully realizing that in all the universe there is no concern for man excepting man's concern for himself, no meaning to life except the meaning which man himself gives to life, no reason or excuse for existence except the possibility that man can make existence worth while--when you have that perspective, that realization, then there comes to you an urgency to do everything you can to make your life more meaningful, more joyous, more worthwhile.

--Alfred E. Smith

31. There is no realm, no force, no personality beyond nature which is the source of meaning and value or which leads us and directs us. Nor is there a special group of religious or philosophical leaders in control of the keys to human virtue and human happiness. We must find them for ourselves.

32. The humanist is filled with wonder and admiration at the creature that is man, at his capacity for accomplishment, for sacrifice, at the intricacy and precision of that nervous system which has made it possible for him to stand where he does today in nature's hierarchy. He is convinced that if we use to an ever greater extent our unique capacities for discovery and for cooperation that future of our race will be a brilliant and a happy one.

33. Humanism teaches two things which seem at first contradictory but which actually complement and strengthen each other. It teaches us on the one hand how deeply involved we are with nature and with our fellow human beings. On the other hand it encourages us to be independent and self-reliant. We cannot play our part well and responsibly unless we are spiritually weaned. Yet we become more fully developed only through social relationships.

34. Consider these central ideas. We ourselves must take responsibility for making the world a better place in which to live; there is no

being or power, called by whatever name, to whom we can shift this task. We have the means to improve the world through effective use of our human abilities.

35. Above all else, perhaps, the humanist believes in freedom; he believes that not only is it a man's right to speak and act as he chooses--within the limits of public safety--but that freedom is the means by which he can develop his human potentialities.

36. Humanism does offer a faith, based on science, in the creative potentialities of man, a faith in the dignity, gentleness, and creativity of man.

--B. B. Stoller

37. Both Christianity and Communism are authoritarian systems. Both impose a rigid theory and a way of life from above; private judgment is subordinated to scriptural text, or church discipline, or to the party line. Both claim to be in possession of certain truths, to deny which would be held impious or treasonable. The history of the Christian Church--whether Protestant or Catholic--shows to what extreme lengths otherwise kindly men will go in suppressing opposition, when they believe they have attained certitude.

38. Seven specific ideas of modern humanism:

As a starting point let us take the idea that this life should be experienced deeply, lived fully, with sensitive awareness and appreciation of that which is around us. Artists and explorers, in particular, have had this keen awareness. This idea has long been important in the humanist tradition.

Another idea is that nature is thoroughly worthy of attention, of study. Early philosopher-scientists, among them Aristotle, shaped this notion.

Still another idea is that of confidence in men. For expression of this we are indebted in large measure to the eighteenth-century democrats who had faith that men can control their own destinies.

A fourth idea is that of the equality of rights among men. This is part of the democratic ideal and for it we are again particularly under obligation to the eighteenth-century democrats.

Brotherhood and mutual aid are chosen as a fifth central idea. This important theme lies deep in most religions. Early humanists were exhilarated to see it given a new justification through the work of sociologists and biologists.

A further idea is that of evolution as worked out by nineteenth-century scientists. Early humanists were quick to realize the implications of development through gradual change.

For the seventh and last idea we have chosen the basic rule of science, the need of proving theory by experience. On this principle has been built the whole modern scientific method of verification by experiment. No other idea has been of more practical importance to the humanist movement than this one.

APPENDIX C

Excerpts from A Firm Faith for Today, by Harold Bosley

Excerpts from A Firm Faith for Today, by Harold Bosley

1. You ask, "What difference does it make whether there is an actual return to religion?". I reply, "The difference it has always been made! All the difference between life and death for all that we hold dear in our civilization!" Consider the desperate spiritual plight of the modern world and you will understand the dire need for a real return to religion.

2. We must either be the best generation, morally and spiritually speaking, that this old world has ever seen, or we will be the last one. We must either rise to heights of personal and social living that heretofore men have either only dreamed of or talked about as some summum bonum to be reached if and when the millennium should come, or be prepared to face the very great probability that the curtain of history will drop on man and all his works in our own lifetime.

3. Probably the most influential creed ever formulated is the Nicene Creed, adopted with many dissenting votes by the Council of Nicaea in the year A.D. 325. It put a formal end to the violent dispute between the Arians and the Athanasians over the relationship of Jesus to God by accepting the trinitarian formula. This proved to be the foundation for all later creedal formulations. It drew the dividing line between orthodoxy and heresy, enabling the Church to bring a measure of unity in a movement that was falling apart into many quarreling sects.

I believe in one God the Father Almighty, Maker of heaven and earth, and of all things visible and invisible.
 And in one Lord Jesus Christ, the only-begotten Son of God, begotten of his Father before all worlds, God of God, Light of Light, very God of very God, begotten not made, being of one substance with the Father, by whom all things were made; who for us men and for our salvation came down from heaven, and was incarnate by the Holy Ghost of the Virgin Mary, and was made man, and was crucified also for us under Pontius Pilate; he suffered and was buried, and the third day he rose again according to the Scriptures, and ascended into heaven, and sitteth on the right hand of the Father; and he shall come again with glory, to judge both the quick and the dead, whose kingdom shall have no end.
 And I believe in the Holy Ghost, the Lord and Giver of Life, who proceedeth from the Father and the Son, who with the Father and the Son together is worshipped and glorified, who spake by the prophets. And I believe one catholic and apostolic Church. I acknowledge

one baptism for the remission of sins. And I look for the resurrection of the dead, and the life of the world to come. Amen.

4. There need be no hesitation in affirming that belief in God is the basic belief of the Christian faith.

5. Religion, then, stands squarely upon known fact when it affirms that there is a principle of Order in the world, and it is well within the limits of logical discretion when it cites this fact as evidence for the reality and rationality of belief in God.

6. There is one other fact to which all faith calls attention as it indicates the factual foundation of its belief in God: The principle of judgment. . . Manifestly, when you study order and growth through the lens of judgment, living becomes serious business! And the effort to live the good life becomes the major objective of any rational person! For hovering over any and everyone who ignores this moral ultimatum of life is the grim warning: "Be sure your sins will find you out." With all the good will and generosity in the world, we have found no way to evade or lighten this judgment.

7. The crowning error of moral and ethical relationships is the idea that what I think is right is right for me, and what you think is right is right for you. This is simply not true.

8. . . .the best definition of God we know: God is love.

9. Love denotes the principle of progressive integration or development in the universe which manifests itself on the human level in the growth of values and those creative relationships through which life unfolds. God, so conceived, is a concrete principle or power, giving stability, definiteness, and creativity to the universe.

10. Men need one another because God in His wisdom made life that way.

11. God not only can be, God is known: known to be a fact; known to be a distinctive kind of fact; known to be the only truly fundamental fact in life and history; known not only as an essential aspect of reality, abstractly conceived, but also as the very heart of the life

process of the universe; known because experienced, both as sustainer of the values which when chosen and followed underlie the creative relationships of life and as judge in the disvalues which, when chosen and followed, impoverish and finally destroy the very meaning of life, known as the One in whom we live and move and have our being.

12. God is this deep and abiding meaningfulness of life; God is this essential togetherness of values; God is this unalterable definiteness in life in terms of which life finds purpose and meaning; God is love; God is the peace that passeth all understanding.

To say that we believe in God, then, is to say that we believe it is possible for us to find the purpose of our life in His Purpose for life, to find the strength for fulfilling that purpose in His strong Presence within us yet always beyond us. To believe in God is to seek to lose our life in His that we may find it again--redeemed, renewed, and made radiant with His love.

13. Now we are going to continue the study and examine that simple phrase: We believe in Jesus Christ. Simple though it seems to be, it differentiates Christianity from all other religions. For other religions believe in God (though with a wide variety of meaning) but the Christian religion alone makes, and consciously makes, Jesus Christ the central fact in faith and life.

14. "We believe in Jesus Christ, Son of God and Son of man, the gift of the Father's unfailing grace, the ground of our hope, and the promise of our deliverance from sin and death."

15. Jesus continues to be "Son of God and Son of man," the one in whom we have our clearest revelation of God's will for man, the one in whom we see God's will for human life exalted and glorified.

16. Jesus Christ is God's supreme effort to awaken us to our utter and complete dependence upon His will for us and for all mankind. He is God's supreme effort to sting us into realizing the true extent of the poverty of our lives apart from God. He is God's supreme effort to save us from ourselves, from the evil of undisciplined and insubordinate passion and pride; from the evil of ignorant and brutal ways; from callous indifference to the needs and rights of our brothers; and from the horror of their inexorable vengeance. He is God's supreme effort to bring to pass that transformation of life which comes when men see life as a trust and living as a disciplined stewardship of that trust. In short, Christ is God addressing us about all that really matters in life.

17. For lying at the foundation of Christian theology is the notion of the triune nature of God--"God in three persons, blessed Trinity." This concept of the multiple nature of God has proved to be a stumbling block for many a thinker.

18. It is fair to say that we can find incontrovertible evidence in human experience, both individual and social, both historical and contemporary, for at least three eternally important meanings which, hitherto, have been carried explicitly or implicitly in the conception of the Holy Spirit.

The first is intensely personal in nature, being in fact this: God is always at work in the life of a person, seeking to redeem it from sin and shoddiness, seeking to lift it onto new levels of light and meaning. . .

The second permanent meaning of the Holy Spirit is this: God is always at work in the world. He is the Supreme Fact in the world. He is no absentee Deity such as that visualized by the Epicureans or the Deists; He is an active, concerned Factor in all that is or is to be. . .

The third meaning of the Holy Spirit is that God is at work in the life of the Christian community.

19. (The Bible) contains the mind of God, the state of man, the way of salvation, the doom of sinners, and the happiness of believers. Its doctrines are holy, its precepts are binding, its histories are true, and its decisions are immutable. Read it to be wise, believe in it to be safe, and practice it to be holy. It contains light to direct you, food to support you, and comfort to cheer you. It is the traveler's map, the pilgrim's staff, the pilot's compass, the soldier's sword, and the Christian's character. Here paradise is restored, heaven opened, and the gates of hell disclosed. . . .It is given you in life will be opened in the judgment, and will be remembered forever. It involves the highest responsibilities, will reward the greatest labor, and will condemn all who trifle with its sacred contents.

--Author Unknown

20. How many times have you heard people say that they believe in religion but not in the Church? Most people who make this assertion, I dare say, would be insulted if you were to point out that that is like saying they believe in love but not in marriage.

21. It ought to be clear that unless this apathy toward the Church can be transformed into active interest the values of religion are going to mean less and less instead of more and more in the dark days through which we must live the remainder of our lives.

22. . . .you cannot have a Christian religion without a Christian Church.

23. . . .if there is to be any spiritual food for the next generation, if we are to recover a consciousness of dignity and worth in human life, it will be because people like us take seriously our responsibility for understanding and perpetuating the Christian tradition which has come to us through the Christian Church. If you mean it when you say you believe in the Church, you will take your stand in the Church.

24. The historic Christian view (of man) is essentially Biblical in nature. According to it man is a created, finite being, dependent upon God both in mind and spirit. He is an individual, to be sure, but not a self-sufficient one. He, of the earth earthy, yet strangely luminous with the rays of spirit. This too is a dualism, the sharpness of which is blunted by the overarching fact of God the Creator of both earth and spirit.

25. But man is a sinner; he is in open rebellion against God. He has taken full advantage of his freedom to follow his own undisciplined desires and prejudices. Consequently, all that he does is steeped in sin, i.e., savors of his rebellion against God. John Calvin gives this masterly statement of the sinfulness of man:

Let us hold this, then, as an undoubted truth, which no opposition can ever shake--that the mind of men is so completely alienated from the righteousness of God, that it conceives, desires, and undertakes everything that is impious, perverse, base, impure, and flagitious; that his heart is so thoroughly infected by the poison of sin, that it cannot produce anything but what is corrupt; and that if at any time men do any thing apparently good, yet the mind always remains involved in hypocrisy and fallacious obliquity and the heart enslaved by its inward perverseness.

Without the activity of the free grace of God man would be hopelessly lost in sin. Due to divine intervention man has a strictly limited opportunity to work the works of righteousness, but his good works never amount to much when set over against his evil nature. Thus both righteous-

ness and humility could be set before man by the Christian gospel of salvation, according to the Biblical view of man.

26. Man is a creature of the creative process, power or purpose which underlies all life. He is a creature whose endowments enable him to see truly, to feel deeply, and to struggle tirelessly for the best that he knows. He is a creature who can betray his own best interests, his dearest relationships, his highest ideals. He can sin against God and brother man--and does so, some men more than others perhaps, but the difference between us is always one of degree, not of kind. Man can so relate his life to the creative will or purpose of God that he can find forgiveness for his sins and the strength to rebuild his shattered life. He is always conscious of "the God beyond who is within"; he is, therefore, a creature driven by a restlessness that seeks complete conformity with--obedience to--the will of God. That, better than anything else, explains why he keeps hurling himself at those barriers which separate him from his fellow men. For to be separated from them is to be separated from the deepest and most effective way of experiencing God.

27. . . .it is a profound conviction of great religion that God can, will, and does forgive the sins men commit against Him.

28. We begin with the empirical fact that given a God whose essential nature is best described by the word "Love" and is most clearly revealed in the life and teachings of Jesus Christ, the divine forgiveness of sin is a legitimate expectation.

29. . . .that is precisely what we are supposed to be--co-workers together with Christ in the creation of a new world. In order to be his co-workers we must seek to be as near like him as we can, even though the achievement of this goal is difficult to the point of being obviously impossible.

30. You cannot study the Christian faith without discovering that the Supreme End not only of the Christian effort but of God's will in history is the achievement of the Kingdom of God. It is the ideal, the goal, the end for Christian thought and practice.

31. The Kingdom of God is that condition in which His perfect will for our good is seen, chosen, and realized. This, of course, exists only ideally at any given time short of its realization, much as docking at a port exists ideally until it is actually done. But this fulfillment is

not forced upon us in spite of ourselves. If it is ever achieved, whether in personal or social living, it will be because we freely choose to seek and humbly choose to serve the will of God.

32. Thus it appears that salvation in its specific religious sense is still viewed throughout the Bible as a deliverance from death and an introduction into the sphere of life. "The word of salvation" means word of deliverance. "The joy of salvation" means the joy that attends the escaping of a great danger. "The rock of salvation" means a rock where you take refuge, finding safety and deliverance from an enemy. "The shield of salvation" means a buckler or defense that wards off harmful blows. Some such emphasis upon Divine deliverance runs throughout all the records, from the earliest to the latest, that we have of Israel's life and thought.

33. Jesus nowhere seems to doubt three things: (1) that he was talking to persons who were "lost" in some sense or other of that term; (2) that they could be saved, or found; and (3) that they shared with God the responsibility for being saved.

34. Saved from sin--what can that possibly mean today, you want to know. And the answer is not hard to find. Sin, as our fathers saw it, is a personal hostility to the will of God. To be saved from sin may mean many things, but none are more important than these: to be saved from the Spiritual death of sin; from sudden repudiation of or studied treason to our loyalty to God; from the temptation and the fact of having put first things in subordinate places; from the slow stripping of life of its sense of worth and value; from the weakening of great relationships through blindness to their meaning or unwillingness to assume the obligations or disciplines essential to them. Sin, so conceived, is not a matter primarily of biology (as our fathers tended to regard original sin), but it does deal with the defacement, the distortion of human personality. Sin, therefore, is not the creation of theologians, though it is the object of their undivided concern; it is rather an all-too-common and always tragic experience in human life.

35. Three basic principles or affirmations recur steadily throughout the teachings of Jesus, constituting the outline of both his proposal and the Christian philosophy of salvation: (1) God is the supreme fact in life and in the world; (2) all men are His children; (3) life is a divine trust.

36. All Christian creedal formulations, ancient and modern, affirm faith in immortality.

37. What a warmly human idea of immortality actually radiates the New Testament! It is a condition or a place in which "God shall wipe away all tears"; where the injustices suffered in life will be rectified, where the true valuation of life is made clear, where you enter into the place prepared for you, where unswerving loyalty to God will be rewarded by His simple salutation to weary travelers, "Well done, good and faithful servant. Enter thou into thy rest." Deeper and more lasting than the various serious disputes which the New Testament records over details of immortality and the meaning and value of the resurrection of the body was the conviction that the truest statement of the work of Christ was this: "I am the resurrection and the life, saith the Lord, he that believeth in me, though he were dead yet shall he live!" Though the writers of the Gospel of John, the Epistle to the Hebrews, and the Epistle to the Corinthians start their interpretation of the work of Christ from different points on the spiritual compass, they move steadily until they reach the center of this common conviction that, in him, sin and death have found their ultimate answer, God's answer.